DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 188   HE 007 863

AUTHOR	Fisher, Allan H., Jr.; Harford, Margi A.
TITLE	Enrollment and Career Potential for College-Based Military Officer Training Programs: Results of a Survey Conducted in May 1972.
INSTITUTION	Human Resources Research Organization, Alexandria, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (DOD), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	HumRRO-CR-D7-73-34
PUB DATE	Nov 72
NOTE	237p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Career Opportunities; College Bound Students; College Freshmen; *College Students; *Enrollment Projections; Higher Education; High School Students; *Military Training; National Surveys; *Officer Personnel
IDENTIFIERS	*Reserve Officers Training Corps

ABSTRACT

A consulting report presents the results of a comprehensive survey conducted in late May 1972 and June 1972 on enrollment (applicant) potential and career potential for ROTC and other college student military officer training programs. The survey yielded data on enrollment potential from: (1) college-bound high school seniors; and (2) current college freshmen not yet enrolled in these programs. Data on military career potential is for: (1) college men currently enrolled in ROTC programs; (2) college men enrolled in certain off-campus military officer training programs (for example, Navy ROTC, AVROC, and Marine Corps PLC). (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

E6503

HE

ED148188

ENROLLMENT AND CAREER POTENTIAL FOR COLLEGE-BASED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS:

Results of a Survey Conducted in May 1972

by

Allan H. Fisher, Jr.

and

Margi A. Harford

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Prepared for the

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

CONSULTING REPORT
CR-D7-73-34

November 1972

Survey Conducted by:

Gilbert Youth Research, Inc.
515 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

Report Prepared by:

HumRRO
Human Resources Research Organization
300 North Washington Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

HE 007 863

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CONSULTING REPORT

ENROLLMENT AND CAREER POTENTIAL FOR COLLEGE-BASED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS:

Results of a Survey Conducted in May 1972

by

Allan H. Fisher, Jr.

and

Margi A. Harford

Prepared for the

Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense
(Manpower and Reserve Affairs)

November 1972

This Consulting Report does not necessarily represent the official opinion or policy of the Department of Defense.

HumRRO Division No. 7 (Social Science)
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

HUMAN RESOURCES RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

PREFACE

This Consulting Report presents the results of a comprehensive survey conducted in late May 1972 and June 1972 on the topics of enrollment (applicant) potential and career potential for ROTC and other college student military officer training programs. The survey, conducted for the Department of Defense by Gilbert Youth Research, Inc., yielded data on enrollment potential from (1) college-bound high school seniors; and (2) current college freshmen (not as yet enrolled in these programs). Further, the survey yielded data on military career potential from (1) college men currently enrolled in ROTC programs; and (2) college men enrolled in certain "off-campus" military officer training programs (e.g., Navy ROC and AVROC and Marine Corps PLC).

The survey was designed by Mr. George Mihaly and Mr. Gideon D. Rathnum of Gilbert Youth Research, Inc., with the assistance of Evelyn B. Thaw. Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. also designed the sample, conducted the personal interviews that generated the survey data, and performed tabulations of the data.

Substantial contributions to survey design and analyses were made by COL Gerald Perselay (USAF), Assistant Director for ROTC Programs (OASD,M&RA) and by Mr. Samuel Saben, Manpower Resource Analyst (OASD, M&RA).

Analyses of the data tabulations and preparation of the report were performed by HumRRO Division No. 7 (Social Science), Alexandria, Virginia, Dr. Arthur J. Hoehn, Director. HumRRO also assisted in questionnaire design and in the specification of sample requirements. The

HumRRO effort was accomplished by Dr. Allan H. Fisher, Jr. with the assistance of Ms. Margi A. Harford. The data analyses and preparation of the draft report were conducted under contract to Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. (Project ROTC SURVEY). The preparation of camera-ready copy of the final version of this report, together with content modifications and editorial revisions to the report, were performed for the Directorate for Manpower Research of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) under Contract Number DAHC 15-73-C-0131 (Project DATA), Task Order Number 72-12-2.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Management Summary. 1

Introduction. 9

Description of the Survey 11

Results 17

I. Applicant Potential 18

A. Potential for ROTC Programs. 19

Demographic Characteristics of Potential ROTC Applicants 21

B. Potential for Off-Campus Programs. 30

Demographic Correlates of Potential Applicants to Off-Campus Programs . . . 32

C. Absolute Program Preference. 39

D. Perspective on ROTC Applicant Potential. . . . 42

II. Factors Associated with ROTC Applicant Potential. . 48

A. Overview 49

B. Career Goals 49

C. Reasons for Military Affiliation 57

III. Awareness of Officer Compensation, ROTC, and Other Military Officer Training Programs. 74

A. Overview 75

B. Awareness of Officer Compensation. 75

C. Awareness of Various Training Programs 79

D. Awareness of the ROTC Program. 84

E. Sources of Information About ROTC. 90

F. Relevance of Monetary Information. 98

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

page

IV. Career Potential Among Program Enrollees. 103

A. Overview 104

B. Career Intention Details 113

C. Program Continuation Details 116

V. Factors Related to Career Intentions for ROTC Enrollees 119

A. Educational Expectations 121

B. Life Goals 123

C. Reasons for Military Affiliation 129

D. Knowledge of Officer Earnings. 137

E. Best Features of ROTC. 141

F. Worst Feature of ROTC. 142

G. Summary. 143

VI. Quality of ROTC Instruction and Coursework. 144

A. Comparison of Grades Achieved in ROTC with College Grades in General. 145

B. Attitudes Toward ROTC Coursework and Instruction. 147

C. Suggested Improvements in ROTC Coursework. . . 151

Discussion. 155

Bibliography. 168

Appendices:

A - Detailed Sample Size Information for Program Enrollees

B - Applicant Potential Items from the Interview Questionnaire

C - The Extent of Draft Motivation by Program Classification

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

ROTC Applicant Potential

Expressed interest in applying for enrollment to an ROTC Scholarship or Subsistence* program sponsored by each of the Armed Services was found to vary substantially as a function of the current status of the respondent, i.e., college-bound high school seniors were far more favorable toward ROTC enrollment than college freshmen at colleges and universities which offer ROTC programs.

College-bound high school seniors expressed a substantial level of interest in applying for one of the college ROTC programs (9% to 18%). This high level of interest was noted among both males and females (see Table I-1, p. 20). In this group, interest was most expressed in the ROTC Scholarship programs sponsored by the Navy and the Air Force. A higher rate of applicant potential was found for the Army ROTC Subsistence program (2 years obligation) than for the Army ROTC Scholarship program (4 years obligation). This finding was noted both on an absolute basis (see Table I-1, p. 20) and on a relative basis, when youth expressed a single preference for an ROTC program or an off-campus program (see Table I-9, p. 40).

Potential ROTC applicants among college-bound high school seniors tended to differ from non-applicants on the parameters of race and family income. Higher applicant potential was noted among non-whites, and male youth from lower income families (see Table I-2, p. 22 and Table I-3, p. 24).

---

*The term subsistence is used in this report to connote ROTC non-scholarship programs, in which financial support ($100 per month) is provided to college students in the third and fourth years of ROTC. Subsistence programs do not pay college tuition, books or fees, as do ROTC Scholarship programs.

Potential ROTC applicants among college-bound seniors also tended to differ from non-applicants in their espousal of various career goals. Potential applicants tended to have higher ultimate educational expectations involving post-graduate study. Males whose career goals included secure employment, challenging work, and elevating one's social level showed higher applicant potential for ROTC programs (see Table II-1, p. 50 and Table II-2, p. 52). Male potential applicants also were more likely to cite military career opportunities, increased maturity, and the status and prestige of being an officer as general reasons for applying for a military officer training program (see Table II-5, p. 60 and Table II-6, p. 62). Male potential applicants were also more concerned about differences between the Services and between ground/aviation duty than were non-applicants (see Table II-9, p. 68 and Table II-10, p. 69).

As a perspective on ROTC applicant potential, evidence suggests that the majority of college-bound high school seniors would be willing to attend college under some type of subsidization -- but that far fewer of these youth report a definite willingness to accept a military officer scholarship (see Table I-11, p. 44). Also, the reported rate of actual application for an ROTC scholarship (5% males; 2% females) substantially lags both the rate of expressed willingness to accept a military scholarship in general, and the rate of expressed interest in applying for a specific ROTC program (see Table I-12, p. 46).

However, it seems possible that increased awareness of the program options available in ROTC could stimulate an untapped ROTC potential for application, since awareness of the details of ROTC programs is rather limited (see Table III-4, p. 85). While almost 100% of college-bound high school youth had heard of ROTC (see Table III-2, p. 80), the program was much more frequently attributed to the Army than to the other Services (see Table III-3, p. 82). This finding parallels the finding that high school youth report a higher level of exposure to advertising for Army ROTC than Navy or Air Force ROTC (see Table III-6, p. 91). Compared to advertising, much lower rates of learning about ROTC from personal communication were reported by high school seniors, with close friends and acquaintances as the major sources of information (see Table III-8, p. 95).

Non-ROTC college freshmen attending ROTC schools tended to report a much lower level of interest in applying for one of the college ROTC programs (1% to 3%) than did college-bound high school seniors (see Table I-1, p. 20). Male college freshmen preferred both Scholarship and Subsistence programs sponsored by the Navy and Air Force over Army programs on an absolute basis (see Table I-1, p. 20). They also preferred the Navy and Air Force Scholarship programs on a relative basis (see Table I-9, p. 40). However, the Army ROTC Subsistence program (2 years obligation) was endorsed by 5% of the male college freshmen in a relative comparison with other ROTC programs and off-campus programs, whereas the Navy Subsistence program was endorsed by 4% and the Air Force Subsistence program by 5% (see Table I-9, p. 40).

Potential ROTC applicants among college freshmen in ROTC schools tended to differ from non-applicants on the parameters of age and race. Higher applicant potential for both Scholarship and Subsistence programs was noted for the younger freshmen, and for non-whites (see Table I-4,

p. 26, and Table I-5, p. 28). Higher applicant potential for Subsistence programs was noted among youth from lower income families (see Table I-5, p. 28).

Potential ROTC applicants among non-ROTC college freshmen tended to differ in career goals from non-applicants. Male potential applicants tended to emphasize monetary goals, adventure/excitement, and doing challenging work. Post-graduate educational expectations were also related to applicant potential (see Table II-3, p. 54, and Table II-4, p. 56). Male potential applicants also endorsed the status and prestige of being an officer, and increased maturity, as general reasons for applying for a program (see Table II-7, p. 64, and Table II-8, p. 65). Male potential applicants cited Branch of Service and ground/air duty as specific factors associated with the decision to apply for a military officer training program (see Table II-11, p. 71, and Table II-12, p. 72).

Applicant Potential for Off-Campus Programs

College-bound high school seniors expressed substantial interest in applying for one of the PLC, ROC, or AVROC off-campus programs (see Table I-6, p. 31).* On an absolute basis, more interest was expressed in PLC (ground) and ROC (surface) programs than in the flight options of these programs (see Table I-6, p. 31). On a relative basis, 4% of college-bound male high school seniors preferred each of the PLC, ROC, and AVROC (pilot) programs -- rates of preference equivalent to that accorded the various ROTC program options (see Table I-9, p. 40).

---

*The Marine Corps sponsors the Platoon Leaders Class (PLC); the Navy sponsors the Reserve Officers Candidate (ROC) program and Aviation Reserve Officer Candidate (AVROC) program.

Applicant potential for the off-campus programs among high school seniors varied by age and race. For males, older seniors showed stronger preferences than did younger seniors. For women, the opposite relationship was noted. While non-whites tended to prefer the "ground" programs (or Navigator/flight officer) more than did whites, whites tended to prefer the AVROC pilot or PLC pilot options more than did non-whites (see Table I-7, p. 34-35, and Table I-8, p. 37-38).

One major finding of the study was the extremely low level of awareness of the existence of the various off-campus programs among college-bound high school seniors. Only 7% had heard of the PLC program (see Table III-2, p. 80), and only one-third of the males claiming awareness of the program could correctly identify the program sponsor as the Marine Corps (see Table III-3, p. 82). Claimed awareness of the ROC program (18% to 21%) and AVROC program (14% to 19%) was higher than awareness of the PLC program (see Table III-2, p. 80), but sponsor identification among youth who claimed awareness of the ROC or AVROC programs was inferior to PLC. Thus, only about 30% of youth claiming awareness correctly attributed the ROC program to the Navy, and about 20% attributed the AVROC program to the Navy(see Table III-3, p. 82).

Non-ROTC college freshmen attending ROTC schools reported interest in the off-campus programs (1% to 4%) at about the same level shown for ROTC programs (see Table I-6, p. 31). On an absolute basis, slightly higher preference was given by males for PLC (ground or pilot) and ROC(surface) or AVROC (pilot), with slightly less preference accorded the PLC (flight officer) and AVROC (navigator) programs (see Table I-6, p. 31). On a relative basis, males most preferred the AVROC(pilot) program (5%) and

PLC program (4%), with somewhat less preference accorded the ROC and AVROC (navigator) programs (see Table I-9, p. 40).

Applicant potential for the off-campus programs among non-ROTC college freshmen was related to age, with younger males reporting higher rates of applicant potential than their older classmates. In general, non-whites in the freshmen sample reported little interest in the off-campus programs (see Table I-8, p. 37-38).

Careerist Potential: ROTC Enrollees

The majority of ROTC program enrollees expect to complete their college program. However, the majority are also undecided in terms of making a career of the military service (see Table IV-4, p. 111).

Current ROTC enrollees reported different rates of anticipated military career intentions, as a function of Branch of Service and Scholarship/Non-scolarship program status. Slightly higher rates were noted for enrollees in Army ROTC (34%) and Air Force ROTC (37%), than were found for enrollees in Navy ROTC (29%), but the highest rate of avowed intention to leave the Service upon completion of obligation was reported by Army ROTC enrollees (see Table IV-2, p. 107). Moreover, Navy and Air Force enrollees were more likely than Army enrollees to state that they would remain in the ROTC program, even if accorded a hypothetical opportunity to leave the program immediately (see Table IV-1, p. 105).

For each Service, enrollees in ROTC Scholarship programs reported higher rates of career potential than men enrolled in ROTC Subsistence programs (see Table IV-5, p. 114-115). The differences were most pronounced for Army and Navy enrollees.

ROTC Scholarship enrollees in the Basic course also reported much higher rates of intention to continue into the Advanced course than did Basic enrollees in ROTC Non-scholarship programs (see Table IV-6, p. 117).

The following factors were found to be related to career intentions among current ROTC enrollees: (1) ultimate post-graduate educational expectations (see Table V-1, p. 122) (2) career goals of "doing challenging work" or "adventure/excitement" (for Army and Navy enrollees), and "learning as much as I can" or "working for a better society" (for Air Force enrollees), as given in Tables V-2, V-3, and V-4, respectively, on pages 124, 126, and 128. The following reasons for applying for military officer training were found related to career intentions for Army enrollees: (1) patriotism, (2) military career opportunities, and (3) the status and prestige of being an officer (see Table V-5, p. 132). These reasons, as well as the opportunity for special professional/technical training, were related to career intentions among Navy ROTC enrollees (see Table V-6, p. 134) and USAF ROTC enrollees (see Table V-7, p. 136).

Draft-motivation in enrollment was negatively related to career intentions (see Tables V-5, V-6, and V-7, on pages 132, 134, and 136 respectively). While military benefits were related to career intentions, potential careerists tended to underestimate the total earnings of a beginning officer (see Table V-8, p. 140), and endorsement of military pay and allowances as a reason for enrollment in ROTC was not related to career intentions in a straight-forward positive manner (see Tables V-5, V-6, and V-7, on pages 132, 134, and 136 respectively).

When ROTC enrollees were asked to state the best feature of their program, potential careerists were more likely to specify the opportunity to become an officer, military knowledge, and the development of leadership potential, than were non-careerists. When asked to state the worst problem with the present ROTC program, potential careerists were more likely to cite a hostile attitude toward ROTC by non-members, or to state that there are some poor quality enrollees, than were non-careerists. In contrast, the ROTC potential non-careerist was more likely to object to unnecessary drills, over-emphasis on dress or hair length, and strict/rigid policy, than was the potential careerist. Further, the potential non-careerist was more likely to state that the best features of ROTC were merely the subsistence allowance or the scholarship program/educational opportunity intrinsic to the program (see Chapter V).

Careerist Potential: Off-Campus Program Enrollees

Current enrollees in the off-campus programs indicated differential military career intentions. Higher rates of career potential were noted for enrollees in the Marine Corps PLC program (35%) and Navy AVROC program (32%), than among enrollees in the Navy ROC program (19%); enrollees in the ROC program also reported the highest level of draft-motivation in enrollment of any of the military officer training samples (see Table IV-4, p. 111).

There was no difference in career intention rates for Basic or Advanced PLC enrollees* (see Table IV-5, p. 115).

---

*The distinction between advanced and basic status for PLC is a convention employed in this report to distinguish upper-classmen from lower-classmen. This distinction is not applied in training status. The terms "Basic status" and "Advanced status" are also used elsewhere in this report to describe segments of the ROTC population, where the distinction between the samples of enrollees in the Basic course and Advanced course was determined directly in this study, and where this distinction is applied in practice by the respective Armed Services in the management of these programs.

INTRODUCTION

A national survey of selected youth populations was designed in early 1972 to provide the Department of Defense with heretofore unavailable information on the following topics:

(1) The potential for applying for enrollment in college-related military officer training programs among civilian youth; and

(2) The officer career potential among current enrollees in military officer training programs.

In addition, the survey was designed to provide information on the level of factual knowledge of, and attitudes toward, ROTC programs and off-campus programs of officer training among civilian youth. Also, the civilian youth portion of the survey was developed to identify demographic, attitudinal and programmatic correlates of expressed interest in applying for enrollment in college-based programs for military officer training.

The survey of military career intentions was designed to explore both the general and specific factors in military officer training programs which are associated with enrollment and with the announced intention to remain in the military as a career officer.

The survey was conceived as part of a systematic effort by the Department of Defense to study the attitudes toward military service among youth. This report presents survey findings for the period of May and June 1972. The DoD envisions subsequent (annual) replications of the survey. A program of continued research on these topics over time will provide the basis for identification of potential trends in the acceptance of these military officer training programs among civilian youth. Further, it would assure the continued availability of data necessary to appraise the current attitudes and reactions of enrollees in military officer training programs to the external events and program modifications that may impact on their attitudes toward a career in the military service as an officer.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SURVEY

Sampling Requirement

The sampling requirements for the survey were generated by HumRRO in discussions with representatives of OASD (M&RA). As an initial activity, a series of discrete target populations were identified to correspond with the major objectives of the study. These populations are indicated below.

DESCRIPTION OF TARGET POPULATIONS

Major Study Objective	Target Populations
	Non-ROTC Enrollees
Estimate the potential for college-related military officer training programs among target populations.	Male High School Seniors
	Female High School Seniors
	Male College Freshmen*
	Female College Freshmen*
	On-Campus Programs (Male only)
Estimate the military career intentions among current enrollees in select military officer training programs.	Army Basic ROTC, Scholarship
	Army Advanced ROTC, Scholarship
	Army Basic ROTC, Non-scholarship
	Army Advanced ROTC, Non-scholarship
	Navy Basic ROTC, Scholarship
	Navy Advanced ROTC, Scholarship
	Navy Basic ROTC, Non-scholarship
	Navy Advanced ROTC, Non-scholarship
	USAF Basic ROTC, Scholarship
	USAF Advanced ROTC, Scholarship
	USAF Basic ROTC, Scholarship
	USAF Basic ROTC, Non-scholarship
	USAF Advanced ROTC, Non-scholarship
	Off-Campus Programs (Male only)
	USMC PLC enrollees
	Navy ROC enrollees
	Navy AVROC enrollees

*In colleges or universities which offer an ROTC program.

A total sample requirement of 5200 was generated. The sample requirement consisted of 500 cases for each of the four non-ROTC populations, and 200 cases for each of the twelve on-campus program distinctions, with 400 PLC enrollees and 200 ROC and 200 AVROC enrollees also included.

Among non-ROTC enrollees, the high school senior population was limited to include only those men and women who planned to achieve at least a college education. The college freshmen population of non-ROTC enrollees was limited to men and women currently attending a college or university at which one or more ROTC programs were offered. Thus, the question of their potential for applying for ROTC enrollment had a reasonable basis as representatives of these populations.

Sampling Procedure

For the non-ROTC enrollee populations, survey samples were generated by Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. The samples were composed of a nationwide high school student sample, and a college student sample. The samples derived from a national probability sample of youth composed of a master primary sample of resident college students, and a special high school sample.*

The second category of youth populations consisted of college men presently enrolled in either on-campus or off-campus programs of military officer training. For the relatively large on-campus (ROTC) programs, the following distinctions were made: (a) branch of Service (Army, Navy, or Air Force); (b) basic course (freshmen/sophomore) versus advanced course (junior, senior); and (c) scholarship status (tuition, books, plus expenses) versus non-scholarship status (expense allowance in Advanced course only). For the off-campus programs offered by the Navy and Marine Corps, no finer sampling distinctions were made than enrollment in the respective programs, due to the limited enrollments.

---

* See *Modern Sampling Doctrine: Master Probability Sample of Young People*, Gilbert Marketing Group, Inc., Marketmath, Inc., 1969.

Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. drew the samples of ROTC enrollees from population data provided by the respective Armed Services. A basic list of institutions* was compared to the Gilbert master sample of colleges, with maximum overlap employed in the selection of colleges. Next, Service population listings** were employed to determine the number of cases to interview per campus, to get the requisite number of respondents by status (Basic/Advanced; Scholarship/non-scholarship), with Service. Given these numeric requirements by campus, ROTC student listings were then sampled to obtain the names of enrollees to be interviewed.

By-name samples of enrollees in the PLC program were generated by reference to a Marine Corps computer listing in which the distinction between Basic/Advanced status could be made.*** By-name samples of enrollees in the Navy ROC and AVROC programs were generated from a master card index of enrollees maintained by the Navy in updated form at Memphis, Tennessee. The sampling was done in March 1972.

---

* List of Educational Institutions Having Senior Division ROTC units: Departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force, September 1971, OASD (M&RA).

**The following references were employed: (1) Status of Air Force ROTC Enrollments, as of 31 October 1971; (2) NROTC Monthly Record, 31 January 1972; and (3) Opening Enrollment Report School Year 1971-1972, Army Reserve Officers Training Corps and National Defense Cadet Corps, CONARC, ATIT-R, December 1971.

*** Quarterly Listing of Active Platoon Leader Candidates as of 31 December 1971, DPD-bab, 28 January 1972.

Sampling Size

The survey sample size consists of the following numbers of cases for each target population. Note the associated projected popluation counts.

SAMPLE SIZE

Target Population	Sample Size	Projected Population
Non-ROTC Enrollees		
Male High School Seniors (college-bound)	554	1,454,000
Female High School Seniors (college-bound)	481	1,432,000
	1035	
Male College Freshmen*	545	320,700
Female College Freshmen*	511	233,500
	1056	
On-Campus Programs**		
Total Army ROTC Enrollees	896	50,236
Total Navy ROTC Enrollees	607	7,459
Total USAF ROTC Enrollees	766	19,967
	2269	77,662
Off-Campus Programs		
Total USMC PLC Enrollees	405	2,999
Total Navy ROC Enrollees	200	760
Total Navy AVROC Enrollees	202	848
	807	4,607
TOTAL SAMPLE	5167	

*In colleges or universities which offer an ROTC program.

**See Appendix A for detailed sample size information.

Questionnaire

Two separate questionnaires were designed. One form was employed for high school seniors. The second form was used for college freshmen (Non-ROTC), ROTC program enrollees, and off-campus program enrollees.* Skip patterns were used to assure question relevance for each sample. Common items were employed for each sample to the maximum extent possible, to permit the development of comparable responses, e.g., so one may compare the level of information about a program held by program enrollees and non-enrollees.

Administration

All data reported in the survey were obtained from extended personal interviews. In conducting these interviews, Gilbert Youth Research, Inc. employs peer-group interviewers in conjunction with local supervision to increase the likelihood of valid responses. A systematic program of interview verification is used to insure data quality.

Data Analyses

Results for each sample were weighted for extrapolation to the respective populations. Data from high school seniors were weighted to project to the national sample of high school seniors, by sex, within geographic region. Data from college freshmen were weighted to the freshmen college population, by sex. Data from current ROTC enrollees were weighted to represent the population distribution in Basic and Advanced status, within Scholarship/non-scholarship status, for each of the three Armed Services. Data from off-campus program enrollees in ROC and AVROC were weighted to the respective populations of these two programs, while data from PLC enrollees were weighted to the population by Basic/Advanced status.

---

*The questionnaires are denoted as follows: (a) #R-960 High School ROTC Survey; and (2) #R-960C College ROTC Survey.

Data analyses consisted of extensive cross-tabulations of each questionnaire item with selected demographic characteristics, and with criterion items on applicant (enrollment) potential by program, separately analyzed for the high school and college freshmen samples controlling on sex. Data analyses for the samples of ROTC enrollees and off-campus program enrollees consisted of tabulations of each questionnaire item controlling on respondent status in these programs (Scholarship/non-scholarship by Service, and Basic/Advanced by Service, for ROTC enrollees; Basic/Advanced for PLC, and ROC/AVROC for these programs).

RESULTS

CHAPTER I

APPLICANT POTENTIAL

POTENTIAL FOR ROTC PROGRAMS

Each college-bound high school senior and non-ROTC college freshman was asked to read a brief, standardized description of the ROTC programs offered by each Service with the distinction made between Scholarship and Subsistence (Non-scholarship) programs.* Respondents were told that Scholarship programs entailed a 4 year term of obligated service, while the term of obligation varied by Service for the Subsistence programs (2 years for the Army; 3 years for the Navy; and 4 years for the Air Force). After reading each program description, the respondent was given three response options permitting a choice between these statements: (1) I will apply for this program ("potential applicants"); (2) I will not apply for this program; or (3) Don't know if I will apply for this program.

Table I-1 summarizes the extent of potential applicants for each program, controlling on the educational status and sex of the respondent. Noteworthy is the higher level of potential applicants among college-bound high school seniors compared to college freshmen in ROTC schools. Also of note is the remarkable lack of difference in rates of potential application to ROTC programs by sex. There was little evidence of differential program endorsement by Service, with the exception of a lower potential applicant rate for the Army ROTC Scholarship Program among college-bound high school seniors.

---

*See Appendix B for a copy of the statements employed in this interview.

PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR SELECTED ROTC PROGRAMS

Base: Target Civilian Youth Segments

Percent* Who Would Apply For:	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools	
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
- Army ROTC (Scholarship)	11.0%	10.3%	1.1%	2.2%
- Navy ROTC (Scholarship)	16.6%	17.2%	3.0%	1.2%
- USAF ROTC (Scholarship)	18.4%	15.4%	1.0%	3.0%
- Army ROTC (Subsistence)	14.7%	14.9%	1.4%	1.6%
- Navy ROTC (Subsistence)	14.0%	14.4%	2.6%	0.9%
- USAF ROTC (Subsistence)	15.0%	8.6%	1.8%	1.1%

*Multiple responses were permitted. Hence, percentages are not additive.

Table I - 1

The reader is cautioned that many of the same respondents may be reporting a potential for application to more than one of the ROTC programs, hence the results are not additive.

Subject to this caution, it is interesting to examine the demographic characteristics of respondents who report differential rates of potential application for each of the ROTC programs. This review will constitute an initial statement of the parameters of the ROTC applicant population

Demographic Characteristics of Potential ROTC Applicants

The applicant potential for the various ROTC programs was assessed in terms of the following demographic characteristics: (1) age, (2) race, (3) annual family income, (4) current (own) employment status, (5) type of neighborhood (city size), and (6) geographic region.* Results are presented for each Service by sex (tabulated separately), by program status (Scholarship/Subsistence), and by educational status (high school/college).

Table I-2 presents demographic data on applicant potential for ROTC Scholarship programs among college-bound high school students. Noteworthy is the differential rate of applicant potential by race (higher potential among non-whites than whites) by family income (higher potential particularly among male respondents from families with incomes under $8,000 per year), and by own employment status except for Air Force among males (generally lower potential among youth employed full-time). Lower rates of applicant potential were also noted by residents of large metropolitan areas. These findings held independent of the branch of service, and were found for both male and female youth.

---

* Analyses are not reported by marital status, since 1% (or less) of the college-bound high school samples were married, and 3% (or less) of the college freshmen samples were married.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Students*

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	11.8	16.6	18.4	10.3	17.2	15.4
Age						
17 years or younger	12.3	17.2	19.0	11.4	18.1	17.9
18 years	11.5	16.0	16.7	9.1	16.7	13.9
19 years or older	10.4	17.9	27.4	12.7	10.9	—
Race						
White	11.2	15.6	16.4	8.8	17.0	14.4
Black)Non-white Other)	14.2	21.7	28.1	16.7	18.1	19.6
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	14.6	24.2	28.1	17.6	18.7	24.6
$8,000-$13,999	10.8	18.5	23.1	7.0	19.5	10.9
$14,000-$19,999	11.4	12.0	14.4	14.8	17.6	14.4
$20,000 or over	8.1	9.5	15.2	5.9	16.2	15.2
Refused/Don't Know	14.3	20.5	14.9	8.6	18.6	15.0
Employment Status						
Full time	11.7	12.3	24.0	3.9	5.8	5.8
Part-Time	13.0	19.1	18.8	11.2	19.2	14.8
Not employed	10.3	15.0	15.9	10.4	16.9	17.4
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	8.5	15.9	14.4	8.6	15.7	14.4
Small Metropolitan	13.0	18.3	18.3	10.2	18.6	14.7
Non-metropolitan	14.5	13.7	26.2	14.0	15.7	18.8
Geographic Region						
Northeast	20.6	19.3	17.5	3.4	11.2	8.7
North Central	10.5	14.0	14.8	7.6	27.9	17.5
South	7.4	18.5	24.4	15.7	14.3	20.4
West	10.7	14.3	14.3	13.2	14.0	11.3

Table I - 2

Table I-3 presents demographic parameters of applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs among college-bound high school students. Findings are in general agreement with the previous results for ROTC Scholarship programs, i.e., the higher rates of applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs were generated by respondents classified as non-white. However, the relationship of city size to applicant potential was more complex, with lower rates of endorsement of the Navy program by residents of non-metropolitan areas. Among "males," higher applicant potential was noted by lower income respondents -- particularly for Navy and Air Force ROTC Subsistence programs.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAM

Base: College-Bound High School Students*

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	14.8	14.9	15.8	14.9	14.4	8.6
Age						
17 years or younger	11.6	16.4	13.3	15.9	17.2	8.8
18 years	16.4	13.2	17.0	14.1	12.1	8.8
19 years or older	20.8	17.9	23.6	10.9	3.6	3.6
Race						
White	13.3	14.5	13.7	14.7	13.5	8.4
Black) Other) Non-white	22.1	17.0	26.5	15.6	18.1	9.6
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	17.4	24.7	29.8	17.1	15.0	13.9
$8,000-$13,999	15.4	14.8	15.4	18.0	14.5	7.8
$14,000-$19,999	11.0	12.0	14.7	19.0	14.4	9.9
$20,000 or over	13.8	7.8	9.2	11.8	10.3	11.8
Refused/Don't Know	16.8	18.1	15.4	11.4	15.8	5.2
Employment Status						
Full time	15.1	7.3	17.9	-	1.9	7.8
Part-time	16.3	17.7	16.7	15.4	16.3	7.9
Not employed	12.8	13.4	14.2	16.6	14.4	9.5
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	13.1	16.2	12.2	13.2	13.1	8.4
Small Metropolitan	16.4	15.6	17.9	12.6	17.3	9.3
Non-metropolitan	13.3	10.7	16.9	23.2	10.3	7.7
Geographic Region						
Northeast	19.9	19.3	16.9	6.2	7.8	6.8
North Central	12.5	11.3	14.0	16.7	21.1	6.8
South	14.7	16.2	20.0	17.2	14.9	11.9
West	11.5	12.7	9.9	18.7	11.3	7.4

Table I - 3

In comparison with the previous findings on college-bound high school senior, analyses of the demographic correlates of ROTC applicant potential among college freshmen revealed certain consistencies as well as interesting differences. Table I-4 contains demographic data on applicant potential for ROTC Scholarship programs among college freshmen in ROTC schools. Subject to the consideration that the overall low rate of applicant potential may render tenuous the analysis of demographic correlates, the following results were noted. First, in terms of race, high applicant potential was reported by non-whites as opposed to whites. This finding is consistent with the finding among high school seniors. Second, age appeared as a relevant parameter, with higher rates of potential consistently reported by the younger freshmen. Among high school respondents, age bore a negligible or complex relationship to applicant potential. Third, there was no appreciable relationship of annual family income to applicant potential among male college freshmen. This finding also differs from results for male high school seniors. These differences merit additional consideration, including the performance of longitudinal research to determine if changes in ROTC applicant potential occur between high school graduation and completion of the freshman year in college.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools*

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	1.1	3.0	1.9	2.2	1.2	3.0
Age						
17 years or younger	6.4	-	6.4	4.3	4.3	6.9
18 years	1.4	4.1	1.9	1.9	1.1	3.6
19 years or older	.3	2.5	1.5	2.1	.8	1.6
Race						
White	1.1	3.0	1.5	1.7	1.3	2.3
Black) Non-white Other)	1.9	3.4	6.1	8.8	-	12.5
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	1.7	-	2.2	7.9	-	10.1
$8,000-$13,999	-	4.2	1.9	-	1.2	-
$14,000-$19,999	1.9	1.9	2.6	4.5	2.3	3.4
$20,000 or over	1.0	4.1	1.8	2.6	1.7	3.1
Refused/Don't Know	2.2	2.0	1.0	-	.7	2.5
Employment Status						
Full time	-	-	-	2.5	2.5	2.5
Part-time	.9	3.3	1.7	.6	.7	-
Not employed	1.5	3.4	2.4	2.9	1.3	4.5
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	1.4	4.3	1.4	2.4	1.9	3.6
Small Metropolitan	1.2	3.7	1.3	1.6	.9	.9
Non-metropolitan	.7	-	3.6	2.8	.8	6.1
Georgraphic Region						
Northeast	-	4.7	-	2.6	-	5.1
North Central	1.1	2.6	2.6	1.8	1.1	2.9
South	2.1	2.7	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2
West	.8	2.4	2.4	2.6	.9	2.6

*Those respondents not in programs for ROTC, ROC, AVROC or PLC

Table I - 4

Analyses of demographic correlates of applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs among college freshmen revealed similar findings for age and race compared to the previous results for scholarship programs. Table I-5 presents the data. In general, higher rates of applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs were reported by younger freshmen, and among males, by non-whites. (The exception was Navy ROTC Subsistence, among males, where the rate for whites was slightly higher). However, in terms of annual family income, higher rates of applicant potential were noted among male youth from families with lower incomes.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools*

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	1.4	2.6	1.8	1.6	.9	1.1
Age						
17 years or younger	6.4	-	9.3	2.1	2.1	4.8
18 years	2.4	4.1	1.1	1.1	.4	.8
19 years or older	-	1.6	1.6	2.1	1.3	.9
Race						
White	1.2	2.7	1.4	1.6	1.0	1.1
Black) Non-white Other)	3.4	1.9	6.1	2.5	-	-
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	3.9	4.8	4.8	2.6	-	2.6
$8,000-$13,999	2.7	2.9	2.0	-	1.2	-
$14,000-$19,999	.9	1.9	1.9	1.1	1.4	-
$20,000 or over	.6	3.2	1.8	3.2	1.0	2.1
Refused/Don't Know	-	1.0	-	-	.7	.8
Employment Status						
Full time	1.6	-	-	2.5	2.5	2.5
Part-time	1.3	3.3	.5	.6	.7	-
Not employed	1.4	2.7	2.9	2.0	.9	1.4
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	1.7	3.8	.5	1.5	1.5	2.0
Small Metropolitan	1.5	2.2	1.1	2.1	.9	.4
Non-metropolitan	.7	1.5	5.0	.8	-	.8
Geographic Region						
Northeast	-	4.7	-	-	-	-
North Central	.5	1.6	2.1	2.3	1.1	1.1
South	2.7	3.2	3.2	1.7	1.7	1.7
West	2.4	.8	.8	1.6	-	.9

*Those respondents not in programs for ROTC, ROC, AVROC, or PLC.

Table I -5

In summary, these analyses suggest that a considerable ROTC applicant potential exists among college-bound high school seniors, both male and female. To a lesser extent, there is evidence of untapped ROTC applicant potential among college freshmen currently attending ROTC colleges and universities. Demographic analyses suggest that ROTC applicant potential does not vary for the branch of service offering the program, but may well vary by age (for college freshmen), by race and by family income. Since these demographic relationships are complex, varying in many instances by sex and educational status, efforts to improve ROTC programs should take cognizance of the previous data. It may also be desirable to perform multivariate analyses of the current data, as well as longitudinal research on the stability of applicant potential over time.

POTENTIAL FOR OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS

Each college-bound high school senior and non-ROTC college freshman was asked to read a brief, standardized description of the Navy Reserve Officers candidate (ROC) program and Aviation Reserve Officers Candidate (AVROC) program, and the Marine Corps Platoon Leaders Class (PLC) program.* After reading each description, each respondent was given three response options permitting a choice between these statements: (1) I will apply for this program ("potential applicants"), (2) I will not apply for this program, and (3) Don't know if I will apply for this program. In considering PLC, the respondent was asked this question separately for PLC (Ground), PLC (Pilot), and PLC (Flight Officer), with the stipulation that the latter programs entailed between 5 and 6 years of obligated service. In considering AVROC, each respondent was asked to state application potential for AVROC (Pilot) and for AVROC (Navigator), with the stipulation that the term of obligated service for graduates of the AVROC (Pilot) program was 4 1/2 years, and for AVROC (Navigator) was 3 1/2 years -- after completion of flight training.

The following table summarizes the rate of potential applicants for each program variant, controlling on the educational status and sex of the respondent. Noteworthy is the higher rate of potential application among college-bound high school students, compared to college freshmen in ROTC schools. Also noteworthy is the lower rate of applicant potential for high school women in terms of the aviation programs, compared to the male high school respondents (the same finding is noted among college freshmen). Also of interest is the generally higher rate of applicant potential for the ground programs, as compared with the aviation programs.

---

*See Appendix B for a copy of the statements employed in the interview.

PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR SELECTED OFF-CAMPUS MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: Target Civilian Youth Segments

Percent Who Would Apply For:	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
PLC (Ground)	16.3%	16.8%	1.5%	3.7%
PLC (Pilot)	9.8%	4.7%	1.7%	1.1%
PLC (Flight Officer)	8.3%	5.2%	1.0%	0.6%
ROC (Surface)	18.6%	14.0%	2.2%	3.2%
AVROC (Pilot)	12.0%	6.2%	1.9%	1.6%
AVROC (Navigator)	11.3%	7.5%	1.1%	0.9%

Table I - 6

The reader is cautioned that the percentages in this table are not additive, since respondents could indicate a potential for application to more than one program variant.

The following section examines the extent of relationship of various demographic characteristics, to applicant potential for these off-campus military officer training programs.

Demographic Correlates of Potential Applicants to Off-Campus Programs

The applicant potential for off-campus officer training programs was examined by age, race, family income, employment status, type of neighborhood, and geographic region. The results are presented for each off-campus program (including subdivisions) by sex and educational status (high school/ college freshman). Table I-7 presents demographic data on the applicant potential of college-bound high school students for the off-campus programs.

The most clearly definable trend emerging from the demographic data for high school students is the declining interest in off-campus programs among white females as age increases. For males the opposite holds true. Interest in these programs tends to increase with age, although this trend is not clear-cut. Both PLC and AVROC pilot training programs bear a more complex relationship to age for male high school students.

Among the high school student sample, race shows no consistent relationship to interest in off-campus officer training programs. However, it appears that whites (male and female) show more interest in pilot training than do non-whites. Annual family income also bears a slight relationship to interest in these programs. High school respondents from families with smaller incomes are generally more likely to express interest in applying for one of the off-campus officer training programs. Employment status, type of neighbor-

hood, and geographic region fail to show any distinct relationship to the propensity for applying for off-campus programs among college-bound high school students.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: ROC/AVROC

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV
Total Sample	18.6	12.0	11.3	14.0	6.2	7.5
Age						
17 years or younger	17.8	12.4	7.5	16.6	9.1	9.3
18 years	18.6	10.6	13.5	12.3	3.8	5.6
19 years or older	23.6	18.9	19.8	-	-	5.5
Race						
White	18.6	13.1	10.2	12.8	6.5	7.8
Black Other } Non-white	19.0	6.7	17.0	18.9	5.2	6.3
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	25.3	12.9	15.7	17.6	7.5	15.0
$8,000-$13,999	19.1	13.6	14.2	19.5	8.6	7.8
$14,000-$19,999	15.1	10.7	11.4	11.3	5.6	6.0
$20,000 or over	15.2	8.8	7.8	10.8	9.3	7.4
Refused/Don't Know	20.5	13.5	9.7	12.6	3.6	5.6
Employment Status						
Full time	15.1	9.5	8.4	-	-	8.7
Part-time	22.1	12.2	11.7	12.0	5.5	5.4
Not employed	15.0	12.6	12.0	18.2	7.9	9.4
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	16.8	13.5	7.6	10.8	7.3	6.3
Small Metropolitan	19.9	10.4	14.2	15.7	5.6	7.5
Non-metropolitan	18.1	14.1	10.5	17.0	5.9	10.0
Geographic Region						
Northeast	21.8	12.9	12.9	7.8	1.9	5.3
North Central	14.8	16.0	10.5	15.9	9.1	9.9
South	22.1	8.8	11.8	16.6	7.9	10.2
West	14.3	9.9	9.9	14.0	4.7	1.9

Table I - 7

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: PLC

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Ground	Pilot	FLO	Ground	Pilot	FLO
Total Sample	16.3	9.8	8.3	16.8	4.7	5.2
Age						
17 years or younger	15.5	14.1	9.2	19.9	6.4	6.6
18 years	16.0	6.3	5.7	13.9	3.3	4.2
19 years or older	23.6	10.4	21.7	9.1	-	-
Race						
White	15.8	10.0	7.3	15.3	5.0	4.1
Black) Other) Non-white	19.0	8.7	13.4	23.0	3.7	10.0
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	24.2	6.2	14.0	20.9	7.0	12.3
$8,000-$13,999	17.0	10.8	7.1	17.6	3.1	4.3
$14,000-$19,999	13.4	11.4	8.4	17.6	6.7	4.6
$20,000 or over	11.0	5.7	4.6	12.3	4.9	3.4
Refused/Don't know	18.6	13.0	9.7	16.4	3.6	4.2
Employment Status						
Full time	11.2	14.5	10.1	7.8	-	-
Part-time	18.1	10.5	9.4	15.9	5.5	6.6
Not Employed	15.5	7.4	6.2	19.1	4.7	4.8
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	18.1	10.9	7.4	17.5	5.0	5.0
Small Metropolitan	16.3	7.0	8.0	16.8	5.0	5.3
Non-metropolitan	13.7	16.5	10.9	15.5	4.1	5.9
Geographic Region						
Northeast	12.3	7.7	6.4	13.0	3.4	4.3
North Central	15.5	10.5	4.3	22.7	3.1	1.6
South	20.6	11.1	11.8	14.9	7.0	10.2
West	15.1	9.1	10.7	16.0	4.7	2.7

Table I - 7 (continued)

Table I - 8 shows the demographic breakouts for the applicant potential of college freshmen. One conspicuous trend is a general shift away from interest in off-campus officer training programs as age increases for male freshmen.

Another notable finding is the apparent lack of interest in off-campus programs among non-white males. On the other hand, non-white females did express interest in these programs.

Among females, the smaller the family income, the greater the likelihood of interest in off-campus officer training programs. Among males, however, there is a complex relationship between interest in those programs and family income. There was no interest expressed in the off-campus programs by male residents of the Northeast.

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: ROC/AVROC

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV	ROC	AVROC-PILOT	AVROC-NAV
Total Sample	2.2	1.9	1.1	3.2	1.6	.9
Age						
17 years or younger	6.4	6.4	2.9	-	-	-
18 years	3.3	1.9	1.1	3.3	2.2	1.4
19 years or older	.9	1.5	.9	3.7	1.2	.4
Race						
White	2.2	2.1	1.2	3.3	.9	.8
Black) Non-white	1.9	-	-	2.5	11.2	2.5
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	4.8	-	-	4.7	4.7	2.6
$8,000-$13,999	3.3	2.0	1.2	1.1	.9	-
$14,000-$19,999	.7	1.5	.7	3.6	-	1.4
$20,000 or over	2.3	2.8	1.4	3.7	1.4	1.0
Refused/Don't Know	1.0	1.0	1.0	3.3	2.5	.8
Employment Status						
Full time	3.5	1.6	1.6	2.5	2.5	2.5
Part-time	2.6	1.8	1.4	1.1	.5	.5
Not employed	1.7	2.0	.8	4.2	2.0	.9
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	1.0	2.4	1.4	4.5	1.0	1.5
Small Metropolitan	3.6	1.8	1.4	3.3	1.2	.4
Non-Metropolitan	1.5	1.5	-	.9	3.5	.9
Geographic Region						
Northeast	-	-	-	-	2.6	-
North Central	1.6	3.1	1.6	5.2	1.1	1.8
South	3.7	2.1	1.1	2.2	1.1	.6
West	3.2	1.6	1.6	4.2	2.6	.9

Table I -8

DEMOGRAPHIC CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE OFF-CAMPUS PROGRAMS: PLC

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Ground	Pilot	FLO	Ground	Pilot	FLO
Total Sample	1.5	1.7	1.0	3.7	1.1	.6
Age						
17 years or younger	6.4	6.4	2.9	-	-	-
18 years	1.9	1.9	1.1	4.6	1.6	.8
19 years or older	.7	1.0	.7	3.3	.8	.4
Race						
White	1.6	1.8	1.1	3.4	.7	.6
Black) Non-white	-	-	-	8.8	6.3	-
Other)						
Annual Family Income						
Under $8,000	-	-	-	7.9	2.6	2.6
$8,000-$13,999	2.9	1.5	1.5	-	-	-
$14,000-$19,999	-	.9	-	5.1	-	-
$20,000 or over	1.4	2.8	1.4	4.3	1.4	.5
Refused/Don't Know	2.2	1.0	1.0	3.5	1.7	.8
Employment Status						
Full time	3.5	1.6	1.6	2.5	2.5	2.5
Part-time	1.5	.5	1.0	1.2	-	-
Not employed	1.2	2.4	.9	5.0	1.5	.6
Type of Neighborhood						
Large Metropolitan	2.4	2.0	1.0	4.0	1.1	1.1
Small Metropolitan	1.6	2.4	1.2	3.5	.4	-
Non-Metropolitan	-	-	.7	3.5	2.8	1.0
Geographic Region						
Northeast	-	-	-	2.6	2.6	-
North Central	2.1	2.6	2.1	5.8	.6	1.1
South	2.7	2.7	1.1	2.2	.6	.6
West	-	-	-	3.3	1.6	-

Table I - 8 (continued)

ABSOLUTE PROGRAM PREFERENCE

After consideration was given by each respondent to each of the ROTC programs and off-campus military officer training programs (PLC, ROC, AVROC), each respondent was provided a list including each of these programs and requested to state in which one of these programs he (or she) was most interested. The response, "none of these (programs)", was a permissible option, hence an absolute appraisal of the concept of military officer training programs could be gained from the results.

The following table presents complete data on the preference for each of these programs (and for none of these programs), controlling on the educational status and sex of the respondent. Noteworthy are the differences between males and females in the appraisal of any of the programs as most preferred. Preference for one of the programs was expressed by 60% of high school males, compared to 47% of high school females. Among the college freshmen, 42% of the men expressed a preference for one of the programs, while only 26% of the females expressed a single program preference.

MOST PREFERRED PROGRAM FROM AMONG SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: Target Civilian Youth Segments

Percent Who Prefer Each Program:	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshman In ROTC Schools	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Army 4-year ROTC Scholarship	7.2%	5.2%	1.6%	1.5%
Navy 4-year ROTC Scholarship	9.0%	6.6%	5.6%	2.4%
Air Force 4-year ROTC Scholarship	12.4%	8.4%	7.3%	6.6%
Army ROTC Subsistence, serving 2 years	8.0%	8.4%	4.8%	3.5%
Navy ROTC Subsistence, serving 3 years	4.3%	4.5%	3.9%	1.8%
Air Force ROTC Subsistence, serving 4 years	4.8%	1.7%	5.2%	2.7%
Marine Corps-Off-Campus PLC	4.1%	6.3%	4.0%	1.7%
Navy Off-Campus ROC Program	4.5%	2.2%	3.3%	2.2%
Navy Off-Campus AVROC (Pilot)	4.4%	2.4%	5.4%	2.5%
Navy Off-Campus AVROC (Navigator)	1.2%	1.5%	1.3%	0.6%
None of these	40.1%	52.7%	57.7%	74.4%
	100.0%	99.9%	100.1%	99.9%

Table I - 9

The Air Force 4-year ROTC Scholarship program was the most preferred option among each youth segment. The Army 4-year ROTC Scholarship program lagged the Navy 4-year ROTC Scholarship program in preference.

However, the Army ROTC Subsistence program (2 year obligation was generally preferred over the Navy Subsistence program (3 year obligation) and the Air Force Subsistence program (4 year obligation). The only exception occurred for male college freshmen.

In total, approximately 46% of the high school males and 35% of the high school females expressed a preference for one of the ROTC programs---either the full Scholarship program or the various Subsistence programs.

The various off-campus programs also elicited considerable support. Among college-bound high school students, 12% of the females and 14% of the males preferred one of the off-campus programs. Among the college freshmen in ROTC schools, 7% of the females and 14% of the males expressed a preference for one of the off-campus programs.

PERSPECTIVE ON ROTC APPLICANT POTENTIAL

The preceding data suggest a vast potential for ROTC and off-campus officer training programs, particularly among college-bound high school seniors. In lieu of longitudinal research, it is difficult to assess the validity of this projection; however, responses to other questions provide a valuable perspective on current rates of application.

Each college-bound high school senior was asked if he had applied for an ROTC scholarship, or expected to receive an ROTC scholarship. Responses presented in the following table indicate that 3.6% of the males had applied for an ROTC Scholarship while another 1.7% were presumably informed that they had already been awarded a Scholarship.

EXPECTATIONS FOR RECEIPT OF AN ROTC SCHOLARSHIP

Base: College Bound High School Seniors

Expect/Hope to Receive an ROTC Scholarship	High School Seniors: College-Bound			
	Male		Female	
	(%)		(%)	
- Have Applied (but not heard)	3.6	5.3%	0.7	2.2%
- Know they will receive an ROTC Scholarship	1.7		1.5	
- Do not expect/hope to receive and ROTC Scholarship	94.6		97.8	
	99.9%		100.0%	

Table I -10

The current potential for enrollment in an ROTC scholarship program in 1973 is thus estimated at 5.3% for males and 2.2% for females. These figures do not include anyone who might join ROTC after entering college in a non-scholarship status, or be eligible for a scholarship of less than 4 years duration. In general, efforts to expand this base would appear warranted, given the difference between these data and the rates of applicant potential for college-bound high school seniors as noted previously in this chapter.

Acceptance of College Expense Subsidization Concepts

Another approach to assessing the extent to which a program of subsidized college expenses would appeal to college-bound high school seniors was obtained by asking these students two questions:

- Would you attend college if it was subsidized by someone?
- Would you go to college on a scholarship if you had to serve as a military officer after graduation?

Although the vast majority (70%-80%) of college-bound high school seniors state a willingness to attend college under some form of subsidization, the rate of acceptance of the concept of a military officer scholarship is initially far less (15%-28%). The rate for males (28%) is much higher than the rate for females (15%).

ASSESSMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF SUBSIDIZATION OF COLLEGE EXPENSES

Base: College Bound High School Seniors

	Males (%)	Females (%)
-Would Attend College if Subsidized by someone		
Yes	79.4	74.4
No	8.7	8.2
Don't Know	11.8	17.4
	99.9%	100.0%
	Males (%)	Females (%)
-Would Attend College on Scholarship if Military Officer Service is Required		
Yes	28.2	15.0
No	57.8	70.7
Don't know	14.0	14.2
	100.0%	99.9%

Table I - 11

It should be noted that the reaction to the question of military officer training subsidization was obtained from respondents before they were presented with detailed descriptions of the various options currently available.

It is also noteworthy that a substantial percentage of college-bound high school seniors (14%) were unsure as to whether or not they would be willing to accept a military officer scholarship to college. Taken in combination with those respondents who expressed a firm willingness to accept a scholarship, some 42% of high school males and 29% of high school females appear to constitute a potential target for military officer training scholarships to college.

Given all these data, an assessment of the "true potential" for ROTC appears complex. To summarize the data, and to present a comparison of responses to the various behavorial/attitudinal indices, the following summary table is presented as a convenient reference.

COMPARATIVE SUMMARY AND APPRAISAL OF ROTC POTENTIAL

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

	High School Seniors: College-Bound Male	High School Seniors: College-Bound Female	
- **Have applied for, or expect to receive, an ROTC Scholarship**	5.3%	2.2%	
- **Express a willingness to attend college on a military officer scholarship, or don't know.**	28.2%	15.0%	Willing to accept
	14.0%	14.2%	Don't know
	42.2%	29.2%	Total
- **Express a preference for an ROTC Scholarship or ROTC Subsistence Program**	45.7%	34.8%	

Table I - 12

It seems that a noticable gap exists between behavior (applying for ROTC) and expressed attitude (willingness to accept a military officer scholarship; or preference for one of the ROTC programs).

This discrepancy may result from an inflation of responses favorable toward the application for ROTC programs. After being given a description of the programs (in contrast to the initial level of awareness/ignorance about the options) many college-bound high school seniors may have found these programs to be attractive -- hence the favorable attitudes expressed.

Taken in total, these data suggest that an untapped ROTC potential may exist among college-bound high school students which merits more serious efforts at advertising and recruitment. Further evidence to support these recommendations is presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ROTC APPLICANT POTENTIAL

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH ROTC APPLICANT POTENTIAL

OVERVIEW

Additional analyses were performed to determine the extent and direction of the relationship of applicant potential to several factors other than demographic characteristics (see Chapter I). In particular, the applicant potential was investigated in terms of its relationship to (1) educational expectations, and (2) life goals. Also studied was the relationship of applicant potential to Junior ROTC exposure in high school. Results of these analyses will be presented in the first part of this chapter.

Endorsement of a series of general and specific reasons for application to military officer training programs was also studied for its relationship to applicant potential. Results of these analyses will appear in the second part of this chapter.

CAREER GOALS

For consistency with Chapter I format, findings for career goals will be analyzed by program category, controlling on sex and educational status (college-bound high school seniors; college freshmen in ROTC schools).

Table II-1 presents data on applicant potential for ROTC Scholarship programs among college-bound high school students. Noteworthy is the differential rate of applicant potential for the Navy Scholarship program among youth whose ultimate educational expectations encompass post-graduate study. This finding held for both males and females.

CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE

ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	11.8	16.6	18.4	10.3	17.2	15.4
Expected Level of Education						
College Degree	11.4	15.7	19.1	10.8	16.2	15.4
Beyond College	12.7	18.7	16.7	8.9	20.3	15.1
Life Goals						
Working for a better society	17.4	10.8	12.6	11.1	12.6	19.0
Doing challenging work	8.4	20.1	21.0	12.6	17.6	9.2
Making a lot of money	9.0	19.1	15.5	8.3	18.8	16.6
Learning as much as I can	7.6	14.6	18.8	8.6	13.9	16.8
Helping other people	8.7	10.3	17.9	8.5	19.8	14.3
Having a secure, steady job	14.8	20.8	20.1	11.6	18.6	15.1
Being able to do what I want to in a job	12.1	19.0	17.8	13.0	14.6	18.7
Raising my own social level	23.5	11.8	23.5	-	-	-
Recognition/Status *	-	60.0	70.0	-	-	-
Adventure/Excitement	12.9	12.9	24.2	13.5	37.8	16.2
Presence of Jr. ROTC Program at Respondent's High School						
Yes	6.8	11.4	13.6	11.8	28.2	19.7
No	13.1	18.1	20.6	10.1	14.9	14.9
Don't know	12.4	17.2	13.6	10.2	15.7	12.5

* Responses are based on a small number of cases.

Table II - 1

However, sex differences were noted in the relationship of applicant potential to life goals and Junior ROTC exposure. Male college-bound high school seniors whose life goals called for "having a secure, steady job" were more likely to express an interest in applying for each of the programs, than were males who espoused other goals. Exceptions tended to vary by Service, i.e., men whose major life goal was "doing challenging work" reported high applicant potential for Navy or Air Force programs, but not for Army. An important goal to potential Army and Air Force applicants was "raising my own social level." For females, there was a negligible relationship noted between these life goals and applicant potential.

Junior ROTC exposure had a complex relationship to applicant potential. For males, exposure to Junior ROTC was negatively related to the potential for applying for ROTC Scholarship programs. For females, the reverse held, with exposure to Junior ROTC related in a positive direction to applicant potential.

Data on the relationship of career goals to applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs among college-bound high school students are given in Table II-2. These data are consistent with previous findings for Scholarship programs, in that (1) higher rates of applicant potential for Navy ROTC are given by youth with post-graduate educational expectations; (2) male youth who cite "raising their social level" as a life goal reported a higher rate of applicant potential; and (3) exposure to Junior ROTC was inversely related to applicant potential for males, but positively related for females.

CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	14.8	14.9	15.8	14.9	14.4	8.6
Expected Level of Education						
College Degree	15.7	14.0	16.9	15.8	12.7	8.1
Beyond College	12.9	16.7	13.5	12.0	19.4	10.3
Life Goals						
Working for a better society	17.4	14.4	13.2	9.5	12.6	9.0
Doing challenging work	14.3	21.0	19.3	11.8	11.8	6.7
Making a lot of money	15.5	16.6	14.1	9.9	14.4	6.4
Learning as much as I can	11.8	16.0	11.8	12.7	15.6	8.6
Helping other people	9.2	8.7	16.4	18.6	15.2	6.4
Having a secure, steady job	12.9	18.2	16.7	27.9	16.3	11.0
Being able to do what I want to in a job	16.7	10.3	13.8	15.4	10.6	13.8
Raising my own social level*	23.5	23.5	23.5	-	-	-
Recognition/Status*	70.0	60.0	70.0	-	-	2.7
Adventure/Excitement*	17.7	3.2	22.6	8.1	24.3	16.2
Presence of Jr. ROTC Program at Respondent's High School						
Yes	14.8	10.2	10.2	19.7	23.9	12.6
No	15.1	16.3	17.8	14.8	12.7	7.8
Don't know	13.6	14.2	13.6	10.1	11.1	7.9

* Responses are based on a small number of cases.

Table II - 2

Youth who espoused the life goals of "adventure or excitement" were also more likely to indicate a potential for applying for ROTC Subsistence programs sponsored by the Air Force.

Analyses were also performed of the relationship of life goals (and Junior ROTC exposure) to applicant potential for ROTC Scholarship programs among college freshmen in ROTC schools. Table II-3 presents the results. Certain interesting similarities and differences are noted with the results for high school seniors. First, higher potential for the Navy ROTC Scholarship program is again shown by males with postgraduate expectations. Among the high school student samples, this finding held for both males and females (see Table II-1). Second, the life goals of college males predisposed to ROTC include "making a lot of money", as well as "adventure or excitement." While the latter results are consistent with the findings for high school students, the former are not. Third, exposure to Junior ROTC programs in high school appears to bear a positive relationship to college ROTC applicant potential for the Scholarship programs, among both male and female college freshmen samples. Among the high school seniors, the positive relationship was noted for females, but not for males.

CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	1.1	3.0	1.9	2.2	1.2	3.0
Expected Level of Education						
College Degree	.9	1.6	3.8	1.8	1.4	1.9
Beyond College	1.3	3.8	1.6	2.8	1.1	4.2
Life Goals						
Working for a better society	2.8	1.3	1.3	3.7	-	2.5
Doing challenging work	-	3.1	3.1	1.6	1.6	1.6
Making a lot of money	4.7	5.9	7.7	-	-	-
Learning as much as I can	1.5	6.1	1.2	1.3	2.9	4.2
Helping other people	-	.9	1.9	1.0	1.5	4.2
Having a secure, steady job	.9	3.3	-	7.2	4.0	-
Being able to do what I want to in a job	-	.8	2.7	-	-	-
Raising my own social level	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recognition/Status	-	-	-	43.5	-	43.5
Adventure/Excitement	-	9.5	2.4	4.2	-	-
Presence of Jr. ROTC Program at Respondent's High School						
Yes	1.2	7.2	2.5	3.5	1.7	1.7
No	1.2	1.9	2.4	2.1	1.3	3.4
Don't know	-	16.8	--	-	-	-

Table II - 3

Table II-4 presents data on the relationship of career goals to applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs for college freshmen in ROTC schools. There is a positive relationship between applicant potential and eventual post-graduate educational expectations, as noted previously for the Scholarship program. Also noted is a higher applicant potential for Navy and Air Force Subsistence programs among male college freshmen whose most important life goal is either "making a lot of money," or "doing challenging work." Finally, exposure to Junior ROTC programs is related positively to applicant potential for Subsistence programs, among male college freshmen. This result is consistent with findings for Scholarship programs (see Table II-3).

CORRELATES OF THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Total Sample	1.4	2.6	1.8	1.6	0.9	1.1
Expected Level of Education						
College Degree	1.3	1.0	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.0
Beyond College	1.4	3.5	2.2	2.0	1.0	1.5
Life Goals						
Working for a better society	1.3	1.3	1.3	2.3	1.4	2.5
Doing challenging work	-	4.5	4.5	1.6	1.6	1.6
Making a lot of money	4.4	4.7	4.4	-	-	-
Learning as much as I can	1.5	6.1	1.5	2.9	1.3	2.6
Helping other people	-	1.0	1.9	1.0	.5	.5
Having a secure, steady job	3.1	1.1	1.1	7.2	4.0	-
Being able to do what I want in a job	1.0	-	-	-	-	-
Raising my own social level	-	-	-	-	-	-
Recognition/Status	-	-	-	-	-	-
Adventure/Excitement	-	9.5	-	-	-	-
Presence of Jr. ROTC Program at Respondent's High School						
Yes	2.1	5.8	1.2	-	2.2	-
No	1.1	1.6	1.9	1.9	.9	1.3
Don't know	-	16.8	-	-	-	-

Table II - 4

In summary, these analyses suggest that a goal of post-graduate education may be a motivational factor relevant to the potential for applying for ROTC programs. In particular, the relationship is noteworthy for Navy ROTC programs. Further, these data suggest that certain life goals are associated with applicant potential for ROTC programs. Among high school males, relevant goals were secure employment, challenging work, adventure/excitement, and elevating one's own social level. Among male college freshmen, relevant goals were challenging work, adventure/excitement, and making lots of money.

The presence of a Junior ROTC program in the respondent's high school held a complex relationship to applicant potential for college ROTC programs. For college and high school women, the presence of a Junior ROTC program was related to applicant potential in a positive direction. However, for high school males, the relationship was negative;* for male college freshmen, the relationship was positive.

REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

Each respondent was presented two lists of reasons for applying for military officer training. One list included general reasons for military affiliation as employed in other youth officer surveys.** The other list consisted of specific reasons generally unique to ROTC or the other off-campus programs, and was developed for use in this survey. Results appear below for each type of reason.

---

*This finding was unanticipated and may well prove to be an artifact of this particular sample of high school students. Replication of the survey one year hence on another independent sample of college-bound male seniors in high school will provide a test of this finding.

**See Fisher, A.H. *Motivations and Attitudes of Officer Candidates: An Initial Report of Findings from the Officer Pre-Comm Survey*, HumRRO Consulting Report CR-D7-72-7, March 1972.

General Reasons

Each respondent was asked to review the following general reasons for applying for military officer training, and to indicate whether each reason would influence his/her decision to apply.

GENERAL REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

1. Military career opportunities
2. Travel, adventure, and new experiences
3. Serve my country
4. Opportunity for further academic education
5. Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits
6. Pay and allowances
7. Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.
8. Avoid being drafted
9. Become more mature
10. Status and prestige of being an officer
11. Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job
12. Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice
13. Opportunity for special professional/technical training

Analyses were performed to determine the extent of applicant potential among persons who cited each reason as exerting any influence on his/her decision. In this section, results will be summarized to indicate the reasons most frequently endorsed by potential applicants.

Table II-5 presents data on ROTC Scholarship potential among college-bound high school students. Noteworthy is the uniform, relatively high rate of endorsement of each of the reasons by potential applicants. However, among males, the reason "status and prestige of being an officer" was cited more frequently than the other reasons, by potential applicants to each program. Also cited by potential male applicants to the Air Force Scholarship program were the reasons of "military career opportunities" and to "become more mature."

Among females, the timing associated with fulfilling one's military obligation was particularly cited for potential applicants to the Navy Scholarship program.

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
General Reasons	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Military career opportunities	15.7	22.7	25.3	14.9	23.8	20.8
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	14.3	18.8	21.3	12.0	19.0	18.1
Serve my country	13.9	20.2	23.4	12.6	22.4	19.9
Opportunity for further academic education	12.9	21.4	22.1	13.0	13.9	18.9
Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits	12.1	21.0	24.2	11.8	22.7	18.2
Pay and allowances	14.0	20.9	23.1	12.7	22.1	17.8
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	13.6	21.9	23.8	12.4	22.1	18.5
Avoid being drafted	13.7	19.5	18.6	17.4	19.7	17.7
Become more mature	15.2	20.4	24.7	14.3	21.8	20.9
Status and prestige of being an officer	18.1	26.3	27.0	15.6	23.0	23.8
Difficutly in finding a suitable civilian job	15.1	19.5	20.5	12.9	21.3	15.7
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	13.3	22.2	22.8	15.7	28.6	18.2
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	14.0	22.1	23.2	12.4	22.5	19.1

Table II -5

Table II-6 presents data on ROTC Subsistence potential among college-bound high school students. Among males, the reason "status and prestige of being an officer" was found to be related to applicant potential for Subsistence programs sponsored by each Service. This finding is consistent with previous results for Scholarship applicant potential. Also consistent with previous findings is the relationship between applicant potential for USAF Subsistence programs and endorsement of the reasons to "become more mature" and "military career opportunities."

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Students

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
General Reasons						
Military Career opportunities	19.2	16.3	20.1	22.6	20.3	12.4
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	18.5	16.8	17.3	16.9	16.8	10.1
Serve my country	19.3	17.1	19.8	19.8	14.8	11.6
Opportunity for further academic education	18.5	18.4	18.4	19.8	17.9	10.9
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits	16.6	17.5	18.8	20.2	19.2	11.4
Pay and allowances	17.9	17.9	19.3	20.4	18.4	10.1
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	17.3	19.6	20.2	19.1	19.2	10.7
Avoid being drafted	17.3	18.5	15.7	22.1	13.2	9.2
Become more mature	19.3	16.5	22.8	20.5	18.2	14.2
Status and prestige of being an officer	24.3	23.7	21.1	21.9	17.7	14.9
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	17.5	16.5	17.3	19.5	16.9	10.2
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	19.8	19.4	19.4	25.5	21.4	11.5
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	17.1	19.7	19.1	19.3	19.6	11.4

TABLE II-6

It is interesting to compare the reasons for military affiliation endorsed by college-bound high school seniors with the reasons endorsed by college freshmen in ROTC colleges and universities. Table II-7 presents data on ROTC Scholarship potential among college freshmen. Noteworthy is the endorsement of the reason "status and prestige of being an officer" among both male and female freshmen predisposed to ROTC. Endorsement of this reason was also given by college freshmen in the context of applicant potential for ROTC Subsistence programs, as shown in Table II-8. This reason, and the reason "to become more mature" were more frequently cited by male college students predisposed to both ROTC Scholarship and Subsistence programs, as noted in Tables II-7 and II-8.

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
General Reasons						
Military career opportunities	1.7	5.1	2.5	2.4	2.1	3.7
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	1.5	3.8	3.2	2.7	1.6	3.8
Serve my country	1.8	4.5	3.5	2.7	2.1	3.6
Opportunity for further academic education	1.6	2.9	2.6	2.6	1.4	4.1
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits	1.6	3.3	2.5	2.7	1.2	4.3
Pay and allowances	1.9	4.6	3.4	2.7	1.1	3.1
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	1.7	4.2	2.8	2.9	1.6	3.5
Avoid being drafted	2.2	3.4	3.7	2.2	1.5	3.5
Become more mature	3.1	6.4	4.6	3.1	1.8	6.7
Status and prestige of being an officer	2.9	6.0	3.7	4.7	1.8	7.4
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	1.1	2.9	3.2	3.1	1.8	5.4
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	1.8	4.8	3.9	2.3	1.2	3.3
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	1.5	3.7	2.4	2.6	1.7	3.5

Table II -7

GENERAL REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
General Reasons						
Military career opportunities	2.1	4.3	2.6	2.4	1.6	1.8
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	1.8	3.0	2.1	2.0	1.2	1.4
Serve my country	1.9	3.9	2.3	2.5	1.6	1.9
Opportunity for further academic education	2.0	2.7	2.5	2.2	1.1	1.7
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits	1.8	2.8	2.2	1.9	1.0	1.1
Pay and allowances	2.4	4.4	2.3	2.3	1.0	1.3
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.	2.4	4.2	2.0	2.2	1.4	1.6
Avoid being drafted	2.1	3.2	2.5	1.0	1.6	-
Become more mature	2.9	5.7	3.9	2.4	1.0	2.4
Status and prestige of being an officer	2.3	5.8	4.0	4.0	1.1	2.9
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	1.8	3.0	1.8	2.2	1.1	1.9
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice	1.6	4.3	2.1	1.8	1.0	-
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	2.1	3.5	2.2	2.0	1.5	1.4

TABLE II-8

Specific Reasons

Each respondent was asked to review the following specific reasons for applying for college military officer training. This assessment followed the evaluation of each program in detail, as discussed in Chapter I. Each respondent was asked to state how strongly each reason would influence his/her decision to apply.

SPECIFIC REASONS FOR APPLYING FOR OFFICER TRAINING

1. Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)
2. Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not
3. Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not
4. How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance
5. If I get expense money for all 4 years of college
6. If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college
7. If I have to go to summer camp
8. If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship program)
9. If I get to go to the college of my choice
10. If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income
11. If I have to go into the military service
12. If I have to take courses in military subjects in college
13. If I have to drill (march) on campus
14. How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college
15. How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete active duty

Analyses were performed to determine the extent of applicant potential among persons who endorsed each reason as exerting any influence on their decision to apply for officer training.

Among male college-bound high school seniors, higher applicant potential for both ROTC Scholarship programs and ROTC Subsistence programs was noted among youth endorsing the following specific reasons: (1) "Which particular Service I am trained for;" (2) "Whether I become an aviation officer or not" (particularly related to potential for Air Force programs); and (3) "Whether I become a "ground" officer or not." Tables II-9 and II-10 present data for ROTC Scholarship programs and ROTC Subsistence programs, respectively.

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Specific Considerations						
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps).	16.3	23.1	27.2	17.2	24.4	22.8
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	15.9	23.3	30.1	15.4	22.6	20.8
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	16.4	22.0	25.8	17.4	24.3	21.7
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	14.2	19.3	23.6	13.7	12.2	18.8
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	14.0	19.3	22.1	12.8	23.0	18.8
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	14.7	21.5	23.7	13.6	22.7	18.6
If I have to go to summer camp	12.4	20.7	22.1	14.5	21.5	18.2
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	14.0	20.5	23.0	12.9	21.7	18.7
If I get to go to the college of my choice	14.1	19.3	22.2	13.0	22.2	18.8
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	14.2	21.2	22.6	14.4	23.0	19.0
If I have to go into the military service	11.9	17.2	21.5	15.3	24.7	19.9
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	13.3	20.4	22.1	14.9	24.2	20.1
If I have to drill (march) on campus	13.2	19.0	20.4	13.0	20.3	17.9
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	13.2	18.1	21.6	14.8	24.1	20.9
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	13.5	19.1	22.2	14.4	23.8	19.6

Table II - 9

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College-Bound High School Seniors

Specific Considerations	MALE			FEMALE		
	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy Air Force, Marine Corps)	21.2	20.1	22.4	17.2	24.4	22.6
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	20.1	20.5	23.3	15.4	22.6	20.8
Whether I become a "ground"officer (do not get to fly) or not	21.0	19.5	21.3	17.4	24.3	21.7
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	17.7	16.6	19.2	13.7	21.8	18.8
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	17.3	17.3	19.0	12.8	22.9	18.8
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	17.0	18.3	20.4	13.6	22.7	18.6
If I have to go to summer camp	19.2	17.5	17.3	14.5	21.5	18.2
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	17.9	17.6	18.9	12.9	21.7	18.7
If I get to go to the college of my choice	18.4	17.0	18.3	13.0	22.2	18.8
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	18.8	18.3	18.9	14.4	22.9	19.0
If I have to go into the military service	17.4	16.8	16.9	15.3	24.7	19.8
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	16.5	17.8	18.5	14.9	24.2	20.1
If I have to drill (march) on campus	16.3	16.2	15.2	13.0	20.3	17.9
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	17.9	16.3	16.8	14.8	24.1	20.9
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	18.0	16.4	18.2	14.4	23.8	19.6

Table II - 10

Among female college-bound high school students, endorsement of the specific reasons of Service and ground or air duty was also found to be related to applicant potential for ROTC programs. However, the female college-bound high school seniors also cited other specific reasons as relating to applicant potential. Included were the following: (1) "How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college;" (2) If I have to take courses in military subjects in college:" and (3) "If I have to go into the military service." Results appear in Tables II-9 and II-10.

Inspection of data from college freshmen in ROTC schools revealed similarities with the high school data between the endorsement of specific reasons and applicant potential for ROTC programs. Among male college freshmen, applicant potential was slightly more positively related to branch of Service, and to ground or air duty, than it was to the other reasons. However, the differences are quite minimal. Results appear in Tables II-11 and II-12.

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
Specific Considerations	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	1.6	4.3	2.1	3.6	1.6	4.4
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	1.0	4.0	3.5	3.1	1.5	5.9
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	1.0	5.5	3.5	2.7	1.7	4.9
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	1.2	3.0	2.5	3.0	1.9	3.9
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	1.1	3.3	2.2	2.7	1.6	4.1
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	1.2	3.1	2.3	2.8	1.7	4.4
If I have to go to summer camp	1.3	3.7	1.7	2.9	2.0	3.6
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	1.3	3.6	2.5	2.8	1.7	4.0
If I get to go to the college of my choice	1.3	3.4	2.7	2.5	1.8	3.9
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	1.1	2.9	2.9	2.4	1.8	4.2
If I have to go into the military service	1.2	2.4	1.6	2.9	1.4	4.1
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	1.0	2.5	2.3	2.8	1.5	3.8
If I have to drill (march) on campus	1.0	3.5	2.0	3.6	1.4	3.6
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	1.1	3.0	2.3	2.9	1.8	4.1
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	1.1	2.8	2.1	2.7	1.4	4.0

Table II - 11

SPECIFIC REASONS RELATED TO THE PROPENSITY FOR APPLYING FOR THE ROTC SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS

Base: College Freshmen in ROTC Schools

	MALE			FEMALE		
Specific Considerations	Army	Navy	USAF	Army	Navy	USAF
Which particular Service I am trained for (Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps)	2.3	4.1	2.0	2.7	1.3	2.0
Whether I become an aviation officer (get to fly) or not	1.2	3.5	2.5	2.1	1.1	1.5
Whether I become a "ground" officer (do not get to fly) or not	1.0	4.9	2.8	1.7	1.0	1.5
How much money I get each month I'm in college (subsistence allowance)	1.5	2.4	1.4	2.2	1.4	1.4
If I get expense money for all 4 years of college	1.7	3.0	1.6	1.8	1.1	1.3
If I get expense money just for the last 2 years of college	1.6	2.9	1.7	2.0	1.2	1.4
If I have to go to summer camp	1.3	3.0	1.6	2.3	1.0	1.3
If my college tuition is paid (Scholarship Program)	1.6	3.0	1.5	2.0	1.3	1.2
If I get to go to the college of my choice	1.8	3.0	1.7	1.7	1.3	1.2
If I get paid to go to college, regardless of my father's income	1.5	2.5	1.8	1.6	1.4	1.3
If I have to go into the military service	1.1	2.1	1.4	2.3	1.0	1.4
If I have to take courses in military subjects in college	1.4	2.1	1.3	2.2	1.0	1.6
If I have to drill (march) on campus	1.1	2.8	1.4	2.1	1.1	1.4
How many years I have to serve in the military after I graduate from college	1.2	2.6	1.5	2.1	1.3	1.3
How many years I have to serve in the Reserves after I complete Active Duty	1.3	2.5	1.4	1.9	1.0	1.0

Table II- 12

Among female college freshmen, the differential endorsement of Service (for Army and Air Force), and aviation duty (for Air Force Scholarship programs) was related to applicant potential. These results are similar to the results for the college men. However, the college women also cited other specific reasons which were slightly related to applicant potential, e.g., the need to drill on campus as related to potential for applying for the Army Scholarship program. However, there was endorsement accorded each specific reason, with less variation evident than was found for female college-bound high school students.

In summary, general reasons found related to applicant potential for ROTC programs include the status and prestige of being an officer, the desire for increased maturity, and military career opportunities. Specific considerations related to applicant potential include Branch of Service, and the availability of ground duty or aviation duty. For females, more complex considerations also appear relevant, such as the term of obligation, the need to take military courses, and the need to drill.

CHAPTER III

AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION, ROTC, AND OTHER MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION, ROTC, AND OTHER MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

OVERVIEW

One major assumption underlying this research was the concept that program awareness functioned as a logical prerequisite to the formation of favorable attitudes toward the various campus-related military officer training programs. For this reason, a variety of questions were developed to assess the level of knowledge and awareness of ROTC and other military officer training programs among contemporary American youth. Particular emphasis was placed on the topic of officer pay, due to the recent, substantial increases in military compensation. Other questions were concerned with awareness of the various programs by name, by sponsoring branch of Service, etc. Finally, a variety of more detailed questions about ROTC programs were employed. This section reviews the major findings for each of these topics. It should be noted that these questions were asked before the respondent was given any information about the various programs -- hence the replies indicate basic knowledge and awareness on the part of the respondent.

AWARENESS OF OFFICER COMPENSATION

Each respondent was asked a series of questions on the pay that military officers receive. After first being queried for any awareness of a recent pay increase, each respondent was asked to specify the date when the last (most recent) starting pay increase for officers had occurred, to specify the current total entry pay for an officer (as well as the current base pay for an officer), and finally to estimate whether this pay was more, less, or about the same as a college graduate would earn in his first (civilian) job.

For perspective, it is useful to compare the extent of accuracy of knowledge and awareness of officer compensation for each of the major samples in the survey, ranging from high school youth to current program enrollees. Table III-1 summarizes these results. The enormous variance in accuracy as a function of sample membership is noteworthy.

ACCURACY IN KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF MILITARY OFFICER COMPENSATION

Base: Each Major Youth Sample

Percent Correctly Reporting:	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Programs (Total)			Off Campus Programs		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Army	Navy	USAF	PLC	ROC	AVROC
- Recent Pay Increase occurred (last 6-8 months)	54.3	30.9	58.6	36.4	90.9	93.0	93.2	84.7	88.6	81.7
- Date of Most Recent Increase (January 1972)	26.1	12.5	28.4	16.3	39.1	44.4	49.3	50.2	59.5	64.4
- Range of Total Officer Entry Earnings ($601-800/month)	8.9	3.7	18.5	10.6	47.4	50.5	52.0	58.5	50.0	61.0
- Equivalence of Officer & College Graduate Pay	29.5	37.5	39.5	38.6	45.0	44.0	44.5	51.7	47.1	38.0
- Amount of Entry Officer Base Pay ($550/month)	10.4	5.8	19.8	9.1	54.1	62.8	56.1	45.8	68.0	67.3

Table III - 1

The extent of claimed awareness of a recent pay increase was high, ranging from over 50% for high school and college males to over 80% for current enrollees in ROTC or other off-campus programs. However, when the level of claimed awareness was validated by asking respondents for the date of the last change and the current amount of officer earnings, it was determined that much confusion existed. For example, less than 50% of ROTC enrollees could state the date of the most recent starting pay increase for officers. Only approximately half of the ROTC enrollees knew the correct range of total officer entry earnings, although from 54%-63% could state the correct amount of entry base pay. But less than 50% of ROTC enrollees judged officer pay and college graduate (civilian) pay to be equivalent.

Under the assumption that enrollment in ROTC programs would present more frequent opportunities to learn basic facts of officer life and to inculcate an awareness of the remunerative aspect of the profession, one might have expected a lower level of knowledge/awareness among men enrolled in the various off-campus programs. However, the data suggested that men enrolled in the off-campus programs were at least as aware of the details of military officer compensation as were the enrollees in the various ROTC programs.

The other major finding from this analysis was the relatively low level of awareness of military officer compensation among the target youth groups of college-bound high school seniors and college freshmen in ROTC colleges and universities. In general, men were more aware of the details of officer pay than women. However, there was no appreciable difference between the sexes in the perceived equivalence of officer earnings and college graduate (civilian) pay in an initial job. This finding may reflect a favorable attitude toward the officer profession as well as knowledge of compensation.

AWARENESS OF VARIOUS TRAINING PROGRAMS

Each respondent was queried to determine awareness of the ROC program, PLC program, ROTC program, and AVROC program. For those respondents who claimed an awareness of any one of the programs, a probing question was employed to determine if the respondent could identify correctly the particular branch(es) of the military service which sponsored the program.

For perspective, it is interesting to compare the percentage of claimed awareness for each program, among representatives of each of the major samples in the survey. Table III-2 presents the findings. Noteworthy is the extremely high level of awareness of ROTC in each sample (over 95%), and the low level of awareness of the various off-campus programs -- particularly among college-bound high school seniors and college freshmen in ROTC colleges and universities. Also of potential interest is the finding that awareness of the off-campus programs is even low among men enrolled in other programs of military officer training, e.g., men in PLC have not heard of ROC, nor have men in Army ROTC or USAF ROTC. Indeed, while most men enrolled in ROC have heard of AVROC, almost 40% of the enrollees in AVROC have not heard of ROC.

AWARENESS OF SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: Each Major Youth Sample

Percent Who Claim Awareness of:	High School Seniors College Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Army	Navy	USAF	PLC	ROC	AVROC
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
ROC	21.0	17.6	13.7	13.2	16.3	52.5	15.2	19.7	98.0	62.4
PLC	6.7	6.6	15.5	3.2	48.9	65.9	32.3	99.2	30.5	38.7
ROTC	97.0	94.6	99.7	99.1	99.7	100.0	99.8	100.0	97.0	99.5
AVROC	19.4	13.8	19.1	15.1	21.9	49.8	16.4	45.3	87.5	99.1

Table III - 2

The previous awareness data must be interpreted with caution, in that even the low levels of awareness of the off-campus programs have been inflated spuriously due to illegitimate claimed awareness. To validate the accuracy of claimed program awareness, it is necessary to review the extent to which respondents could identify correctly the branch of service sponsoring each program. Table III-3 presents the findings. The results indicate that the majority of the target group of college-bound high school seniors who claim awareness of ROTC attribute the program to the Army, while attribution to the Navy or Air Force is much lower. With the exception of PLC which is correctly attributed to the USMC by most high school females (not males) and by most male college freshmen, correct attribution of the other off-campus programs (ROC and AVROC) to the Navy was not in evidence among the target groups of civilian youth.*

---

*Indeed, among youth who claimed to have heard of the ROC and AVROC programs, the majority attributed the programs to the Air Force -- instead of the Navy.

AWARENESS OF SERVICES SPONSORING SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Base: Percent Claiming Awareness of Each Program

Percent Correct Identification of Sponsoring Service	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools	
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)
ROC (% Navy)	30.1	31.7	28.9	21.4
PLC (% USMC)	35.1	50.5	75.9	41.9
ROTC:				
- % Army	60.6	62.1	74.4	72.2
- % Navy	24.2	21.9	49.0	37.5
- % USAF	29.5	26.1	52.4	41.9
AVROC (% Navy)	21.3	19.7	23.0	15.0

Table III - 3

AWARENESS OF SERVICES SPONSORING SELECTED MILITARY OFFICER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Percent Correct Identification Sponsoring Service	ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
ROC (% Navy)	49.5	59.8	39.3	45.6	97.4	62.8
PLC (% USMC)	96.2	94.2	85.1	99.8	93.5	97.3
ROTC:						
- % Army	88.1	79.1	86.3	92.6	83.6	75.6
- % Navy	64.6	81.5	81.6	56.9	64.5	50.7
- % USAF	69.5	79.4	90.3	54.7	60.4	52.7
AVROC (% Navy)	34.5	69.4	54.7	49.1	89.2	100.0

Table III - 3 (Continued)

Among current program enrollees, the overwhelming majority of men in each program correctly identified the Service which sponsored their program. But there was evidence of confusion regarding the sponsorship of other programs. For example, only 50% of Army ROTC enrollees knew that the Navy sponsored ROC (and only 35% knew that the Navy sponsored AVROC). Less than half of the PLC enrollees knew that the Navy sponsored ROC and AVROC.

It seems reasonable to conclude that awareness of the various off-campus programs among the target segments of the civilian youth population is low, and further that current program enrollees would be unlikely to dispel this ignorance held by their younger peers -- with the possible exception of discussing their own program.

AWARENESS OF THE ROTC PROGRAM

Awareness of details regarding the ROTC program was assessed by querying each respondent on the following topics: (a) the particular types of college costs which were paid for by ROTC, (b) knowledge of the existence of both Scholarship and Non-scholarship programs, (c) awareness that the scholarship and subsistence benefits differ, (d) awareness of the recent increase in subsistence allowance, i.e., an increase within six to eight months of the interview, and (e) awareness of the amount of the current monthly subsistence allowance ($100).

For perspective, it is useful to compare the extent of knowledge and awareness of ROTC programs for each of the major samples in the survey, ranging from college-bound high school seniors to enrollees in current ROTC programs. Table III-4 presents the results. The data indicate high awareness of ROTC among ROTC enrollees, lower levels of

ACCURATE KNOWLEDGE AND AWARENESS OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE ROTC PROGRAMS

Base: Each Major Youth Sample

Percent Correct Knowledge/ Awareness of:	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Enrollees (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- ROTC pays both college tuition and other expenses	28.7	27.1	42.6	32.4	50.6	58.0	50.7	33.3	45.5	43.0
- Both Scholarship & Non-scholarship programs	32.4	25.1	54.3	42.3	92.9	98.7	94.3	59.1	61.4	58.5
- The distinction between scholarship & subsistence allowances	47.0	46.4	68.7	74.1	84.5	79.2	89.4	74.2	82.5	91.6
- The recent increase in the subsistence allowance	28.8	15.6	31.5	27.5	91.0	97.8	94.4	51.1	36.4	46.1
- The precise amount of the current monthly subsistence allowance ($100)	24.8	17.2	37.1	28.2	91.1	98.2	93.0	70.2	50.0	57.0

Table III - 4

knowledge and awareness among both off-campus program enrollees and non-ROTC freshmen at ROTC colleges and universities, with the lowest awareness levels among college-bound high school seniors.

As a rule, awareness and knowledge of ROTC is higher among males than among females. More refined analyses revealed that among the segment of college-bound high school seniors, over 50% thought that scholarship and subsistence benefits were equivalent. The rate was approximately 25% among college freshmen at ROTC schools. Among high school seniors and college freshmen who had not heard of both ROTC Scholarship and Subsistence programs, most had heard only of the Scholarship program, but very few had only heard of the Subsistence program. Among high school seniors and college freshmen who did not know that ROTC paid college expenses plus tuition, the majority were aware that ROTC paid for college tuition (only). In the same sample segments, most youth were unaware of a recent increase in the ROTC subsistence allowance, but nonetheless estimated the current monthly payment at either $50, $100, or $150.

Among current ROTC enrollees and off-campus program enrollees, less than 20% felt that scholarship and subsistence benefits were equivalent, and among ROTC enrollees only, less than 5% had heard of only the Scholarship program, while 1% or less had only heard of the Subsistence program. However, approximately 20% of the enrollees in off-campus programs had heard of only ROTC Scholarship programs -- not ROTC Subsistence programs. In specifying which college costs were paid by ROTC, between 24% and 40% of ROTC enrollees and off-campus program enrollees stated that ROTC paid college tuition (only), not the correct response that ROTC also paid for other college expenses. A substantial number of off-campus program enrollees were unaware of the recent increase in the amount of the ROTC monthly subsistence allowance, and estimates of the amount tended to err on the low side, i.e., between 10% and 30% set the amount at $50 per month.

Each respondent was also asked if persons enrolled in ROTC earned college credit for ROTC coursework.* While the vast majority of current ROTC enrollees answered affirmatively, the results for off-campus enrollees suggested some ignorance. The percentages indicating that college credit could be earned in ROTC were as follows: AVROC, 75%; PLC, 68%; and ROC, 59%. Approximately 20% of the men enrolled in these programs stated that one could not earn college credit for ROTC. Among college freshmen in ROTC schools, the rate of affirmative responses to this question was 71% for both males and females. The rate among high school seniors was: male, 75%; females, 68%.

Finally, each respondent was asked to specify the term of obligated service for graduates of ROTC Scholarship programs. Responses were requested separately for each Service, i.e., Army ROTC, Navy ROTC, and Air Force ROTC. Table III-5 presents the results in terms of percent correct replies (4 year term of obligation) for each major sample in the survey.

---

*Interpretation of the extent of accuracy in response to this question is somewhat ambiguous, due to the variation between institutions in the policy of according college credit for ROTC courses.

CORRECT KNOWLEDGE OF THE TERM OF OBLIGATED SERVICE FOR ROTC SCHOLARSHIP GRADUATES

Base: Each Major Youth Sample

Percent Aware of Four Year Obligation, by Service	High School Seniors: College-Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Enrollees (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Male (%)	Female (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- Army ROTC	31.1	23.4	41.9	27.5	66.1	45.3	34.1	28.7	33.5	37.6
- Navy ROTC	32.5	23.5	45.5	28.6	51.2	90.5	53.3	50.4	49.4	60.3
- USAF ROTC	37.8	31.6	53.0	31.8	61.4	65.5	87.4	41.5	56.9	56.9

Table III - 5

In general, awareness that an ROTC scholarship requires a four year committment was quite low among target youth segments, e.g., college-bound high school seniors and even college freshmen in ROTC schools. Awareness was only slightly higher among enrollees in the off-campus programs. Only ROTC enrollees appeared aware of the obligation, and even in this case, awareness seemed restricted to one's own program, e.g., USAF ROTC men knew the obligation for USAF ROTC, but not for Army ROTC. Indeed, when queried about the obligated service term for the other Services, between 13% and 31% of current ROTC enrollees claimed that they did not know. Also many current ROTC enrollees attributed a shorter term of service to the Army (2 years, or 3 years) than they did to the other Service programs. This confusion was also noted among the college-bound high school senior segment, where 24% of males and 28% of females thought that an ROTC scholarship required only two years of obligated service. Analogous rates for non-ROTC college freshmen were 24% for males, and 23% for females. Although males in the target youth segments were generally better informed than females regarding the term of obligated service associated with an ROTC scholarship (see Table III-5), there was a substantial "don't know" rate for both sexes,* regardless of current educational status, or the particular Service toward which the question was directed.

---

*For males, the rate varied from 22% to 39% who did not know the term of obligated service. For females, the rate varied from 32% to 45%.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT ROTC

Each respondent in the survey was asked two questions concerning potential sources of knowledge about ROTC programs. First, personal communications with various influential persons were explored (parents, peers, school authorities, recruiters). Second, exposure to Service advertising for college ROTC was queried. Results for each topic are given in this section.

Advertising Exposure

Each respondent was asked: "Have you seen or heard any advertising for college ROTC? If so, for which college ROTC program have you seen or heard it?" The respondent could reply by Service, or indicate advertising exposure for all of the Services, or report no exposure to advertising for college ROTC. The general findings indicate a high degree of reported exposure to advertising for college ROTC programs -- particularly Army ROTC.

Among college-bound high school seniors, 22% of the males and 35% of the females reported no exposure to advertising for college ROTC. Those youth reporting exposure indicated that they had seen or heard advertising either for Army ROTC (only) or for all of the Services. Mention of exposure only to Navy ROTC or Air Force ROTC was limited.

Among college freshmen in ROTC schools, few interviewees reported no exposure to ROTC advertising. Only 8% of the males and 19% of the females claimed no exposure. Exposure to advertising for Army ROTC (only) or exposure to advertising for each of the Services were reported by both sexes, more so than exposure solely to Navy or Air Force ROTC advertising.

REPORTED EXPOSURE TO ADVERTISING FOR COLLEGE ROTC

Base: Target Civilian Population

Reported Service Program Exposure	High School Seniors College Bound		College Freshmen In ROTC Schools	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
	%	%	%	%
Army ROTC	32.7	32.6	36.4	37.7
Navy ROTC	10.5	8.7	16.3	15.1
USAF ROTC	13.7	15.0	15.4	18.3
All of them	32.8	19.6	43.0	28.7
Have not seen or heard any advertising	22.2	35.1	7.9	18.8

Table III - 6

Among current ROTC program enrollees, only 3%-5% reported no exposure to ROTC advertising. However, even among this select group, higher exposure rates to Army ROTC were found than exposure to advertising for the other Services. However, a "Service-factor" was noted, in that Navy ROTC enrollees were more likely to report exposure solely to Navy ROTC ads, Army ROTC enrollees to Army ROTC ads, and USAF ROTC enrollees to Air Force ROTC ads. Results appear in Table III-7.

Enrollees in off-campus programs tended to report exposure to college ROTC advertising at approximately the same level as non-ROTC college freshmen, i.e., 10%-14% reported no exposure, and Army ROTC (only) exposure was reported by 40%-50%.

REPORTED EXPOSURE TO ADVERTISING FOR COLLEGE ROTC

Base: Current Program Enrollees

Reported Service Program Exposure	ROTC Programs (Total) Army (%)	ROTC Programs (Total) Navy (%)	ROTC Programs (Total) USAF (%)	Off-Campus Programs PLC (%)	Off-Campus Programs ROC (%)	Off-Campus Programs AVROC (%)
Army ROTC	54.1	34.3	48.5	49.9	40.0	51.1
Navy ROTC	13.2	31.9	14.0	21.8	20.0	15.3
USAF ROTC	21.0	12.4	25.6	17.4	9.5	21.8
All of them	40.0	45.9	40.5	31.9	34.5	26.3
Have not seen or heard any advertising	3.4	4.6	4.2	8.6	13.6	9.4

Table III -7

Personal Communications

The extent to which various persons provided each respondent with information about ROTC was explored in two different methods, with one approach employed for college-bound high school seniors and an alternative approach used for each college sample.

College-bound high school seniors were asked the following "open-ended" question: "Except for now, who has ever given you any information about ROTC?" Responses to the question were content-analyzed and coded for tabulation. Some 32% of male youth and 48% of female youth reported no personal sources of ROTC information. Many of the respondents cited either recruiting materials or other impersonal media. Counselors or teachers were cited as sources by 11% of males and 4% of females.

Friends or school acquaintances were most frequently mentioned as personal sources of information, but even this category was mentioned by only 12%-14% of these youth.

PERSONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT ROTC

Base: College Bound High School Students

Source of Information	MALE (%)	FEMALE (%)
Parent/Relative/Friends (Net)	25.6	20.8
Father	5.6	3.4
Mother	.8	.2
Sisters/Brothers	4.9	4.3
Other Relatives	3.1	4.1
Friends/School Acquaintances	14.1	12.0
Recruiting Material (Net)	27.4	14.0
Pamphlets/Brochures	9.9	4.4
Advertisements	4.2	3.0
Military Recruiter at School	8.2	5.9
Military Recruiter away from School	7.6	1.6
Counsel /Teachers	11.3	3.6
People in Service	1.7	.8
Members of ROTC	3.6	2.1
Media (Net)	7.5	12.6
Newspapers/Magazines/Books	3.0	5.6
TV/Radio	5.4	8.5
Draft Board	.4	-
Other	2.3	1.9
No One	32.0	47.6
Don't Know/No Answer	4.1	3.9

Table III - 8

College students were asked a more structured question concerning personal communications about ROTC. Each member of the college samples was asked: "How did you find out about ROTC? Was it from your....?" At this point each respondent was read a common list of potential sources, including the following: Father, Mother, Brothers, Other relatives, Close friends, School acquaintances, Teachers, Counselors, Military recruiter at school, or Military recruiter away from school. Respondents were also probed to determine if they had heard of ROTC from some other source.

Most respondents at the college level had obtained ROTC information from some personal source. Endorsement of close friends and school acquaintances as sources of information about ROTC was noteworthy, for each college sample -- non-ROTC freshmen, current ROTC enrollees, and enrollees in the PLC, ROC, and AVROC programs. However, current ROTC enrollees also cited parental influence (father) as an information source (22%-30%), and military recruiters (at school) as a source (18%-22%). Enrollees in Navy ROTC and Air Force ROTC were somewhat more likely to endorse a counselor as an information source (27% and 24%, respectively) than were Army ROTC enrollees (18%). Table III-9 presents the complete data.

PERSONAL SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT ROTC

Base: Major College Student Samples

Source of Information	College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
Father	13.6	13.1	22.1	30.3	24.5	8.6	13.9	12.9
Mother	3.7	4.1	2.8	4.8	4.4	2.2	3.0	2.5
Brothers	10.1	15.4	12.5	8.2	9.7	7.4	10.0	8.4
Other Relatives	6.6	7.8	9.7	6.6	7.1	6.3	5.5	5.4
Close Friends	23.8	31.4	22.0	16.9	17.5	22.5	28.0	27.7
School Acquaintances	28.3	44.1	17.8	12.4	12.9	27.8	32.5	35.6
Teachers	5.4	7.9	8.4	5.1	4.3	4.6	5.0	5.9
Counselors	10.5	7.8	17.7	27.3	23.7	7.2	11.4	9.9
Military Recruiters (at school)	21.1	10.3	20.4	21.6	17.7	27.4	24.5	29.2
Military Recruiters (away from school)	9.8	4.2	10.1	10.2	9.6	7.9	11.1	10.8
Literature Received by mail	13.3	4.2	4.0	6.3	4.9	4.8	4.5	1.5
Newspaper/TV/Magazines	8.3	7.4	5.2	2.5	3.4	4.8	6.4	2.0
ROTC/NROTC Instructors	.7	-	2.4	1.0	2.3	1.4	3.0	1.5
No One In Particular	.9	1.5	.8	.4	2.8	1.9	1.4	2.0
Other	3.4	3.0	5.7	2.5	6.4	4.7	3.9	.9
Don't Remember	-	.3	.4	.2	.2	.9	-	-
Don't Know	.7	1.2	.1	.2	.1	-	-	-

Table III - 9

RELEVANCE OF MONETARY INFORMATION

In the initial portion of this chapter, data were presented which indicated that only 8.9% of males and 3.7% of females in the target group of college-bound high school seniors could estimate the correct amount of total monthly earnings for a beginning officer (see Table III-1). This finding raised a key question: to what extent is accurate information on officer earnings related to the expressed interest of these youth in applying for the ROTC program? Analyses were performed to address this question. Estimates of total monthly earnings for beginning officers were classified as being underestimates, overestimates, accurate estimates ($601-800 per month), or "don't know" responses. Estimates were then arrayed for only those college-bound high school seniors who expressed a willingness to apply for each category of ROTC programs. These estimates for potential male and female applicants were then compared to the estimates derived for the total samples of male and female students.

Data on potential applicants to ROTC scholarship programs appear in Table III-10. Compared to the total male and total female estimates, fewer potential applicants admitted that they did not know the beginning earnings of a military officer. Further, the potential applicants were more likely to generate accurate estimates. However, the potential applicants also tended to underestimate officer earnings. This finding held for both sexes, and for applicants to each program with the exception of male potential applicants to the Army ROTC Scholarship program.

RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICANT POTENTIAL FOR SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAMS TO ESTIMATED TOTAL BEGINNING OFFICER EARNINGS

Base: Potential Applicants to ROTC Scholarship Programs Among College-Bound High School Students*

Estimate of Beginning Officer Earnings	MALE				FEMALE			
	Army Applicants (%)	Navy Applicants (%)	USAF Applicants (%)	Total Males (%)	Army Applicants (%)	Navy Applicants (%)	USAF Applicants (%)	Total Females (%)
- Under estimates ($600 a month or less)	46.5	56.2	53.5	49.3	46.6	44.7	51.0	36.8
- Accurate estimate ($601-$800 a month)	15.1	10.3	16.1	8.9	4.7	6.9	5.9	3.7
- Over estimates ($801 a month or more)	7.6	6.7	4.8	3.6	-	-	-	.7
Don't Know	31.4	27.3	25.1	38.3	48.6	48.8	43.2	58.8

---

* Includes applicants, non-applicants, and "don't know" respondents.

Table III - 10

Analyses were also performed on potential applicants to ROTC Subsistence programs. Potential applicants to these programs were again found to provide underestimates of total earnings for beginning officers. Male potential applicants also estimated these earnings with more accuracy than did the total sample of male, college-bound high school seniors. For females, only potential applicants to the Army Subsistence program were more accurate than the total sample of females. Results appear in Table III-11.

RELATIONSHIP OF APPLICANT POTENTIAL FOR SUBSISTENCE PROGRAMS TO ESTIMATED TOTAL BEGINNING OFFICER EARNINGS

Base: Potential Applicants to ROTC Subsistence Programs Among College-Bound High School Students

	MALE				FEMALE			
Awareness of Beginning Officer Salary	Army Applicants (%)	Navy Applicants (%)	USAF Applicants (%)	Total Males (%)	Army Applicants (%)	Navy Applicants (%)	USAF Applicants (%)	Total Females (%)
- Under estimates ($600 a month or less)	50.8	57.0	56.5	49.3	47.9	51.5	50.3	36.8
- Accurate estimates ($601-$800 a month)	14.4	9.7	16.1	8.9	10.3	3.4	3.3	3.7
- Over estimates ($801 a month or more)	4.6	7.0	6.1	3.6	-	-	3.3	.7
Don't Know	31.2	26.4	22.2	38.3	41.8	45.1	43.1	58.8

Table III - 11

These findings, consistent with certain results of Chapter II,* appear to challenge the position that economic motivation is central in the decision to enter the military service as an officer. This finding merits additional research involving other items of a factual nature about the college ROTC programs or military service in general to determine their potential relevance in the decision to apply for these military officer training programs.

This need for research is further justified in view of the evidence presented in Chapter V of this report that potential careerists among the current enrollee population are also more likely to underestimate entry earnings than are potential non-careerists.

---

*In Chapter II it was noted that general and specific reasons other than pay were more frequently cited as influences in applicant potential (see page 73 for a summary of major reasons). However, "making lots of money" was found to be one life goal associated with applicant potential (see page 57).

CHAPTER IV

CAREER POTENTIAL AMONG PROGRAM ENROLLEES

CAREER POTENTIAL AMONG PROGRAM ENROLLEES

OVERVIEW

One major objective of this survey was to estimate the size of the career population among ROTC students, and among enrollees in off-campus programs for training military officers such as the USMC PLC program and the Navy ROC and AVROC programs. As an introduction to this topic, it is useful to review some comparative data across programs on the career intentions of current program enrollees, contrasting their immediate career intentions with their long-range career intentions. This comparison indicates the extent to which there is agreement between expectations for completing the college program versus making a career of military service as an officer.

Immediate career intentions were assessed by asking each enrollee a hypothetical question: "If you had no military obligation and were permitted to leave your military officer training program, would you do so?" The permissible response options read (a) "Yes, I would leave the program as soon as possible," (b) "No, I would stay in the program," and (c) "I don't know." In response to this question, 73.8% of all ROTC enrollees stated that they would remain in the program. Equivalent or higher responses were provided by enrollees in the off-campus programs. However, the differences between programs were interesting, and merit discussion.

Table IV-1 indicates that the highest rates of immediate career intentions were reported by Navy ROTC and Air Force ROTC enrollees, and by PLC and AVROC enrollees. Somewhat lower rates were generated by enrollees in the Army ROTC program and the Navy ROC program.

IMMEDIATE CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Total Current Program Enrollees

	ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
Immediate Career Intentions*	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- I would stay in the program	70.2	77.5	81.4	86.5	73.6	93.2
- I would leave the program	18.2	15.3	13.3	8.7	21.1	6.5
- I don't know	11.7	7.1	5.4	4.8	5.5	0.5
	100.1%	99.9%	100.1%	100.0%	100.2%	100.2%

* Given an opportunity to leave the program.

Table IV - 1

Cognizant of the fact that an assessment of long-range career intentions is essential in manpower planning, each current program enrollee was also asked the following question: "Do you plan to stay in the Service at the end of your initial obligated period of service as a commissioned officer?" The respondent was permitted one of four response options: (a) "Yes, I plan to make the Service my career," (b) "Yes, I plan to stay in for a while," (c) "I am undecided," and (d) "No, I plan to leave when I complete my obligation." In response to this question, most enrollees reported indecision (regardless of the program in which enrolled). The highest rates of anticipated military career intentions were reported by USAF ROTC enrollees, USMC PLC enrollees, and Navy AVROC enrollees. Table IV-2 presents the complete data.

LONG-RANGE CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Total Current Program Enrollees

Long-Range Career Plans	ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- Military Career	18.0	15.6	22.9	23.6	8.9	19.8
- Stay in Service for a while	15.8	12.9	14.5	11.6	10.0	11.9
- Undecided	40.8	50.5	49.0	45.3	55.0	59.9
- Leave upon completion of obligation	25.4	21.0	13.6	19.5	26.1	8.4
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table IV -2

The overall findings on immediate and long-range career intentions suggest that the majority of program enrollees will complete their college program, but do not anticipate making a career of military service. However, the high rate of "undecided" as shown in Table IV-2 suggests that the potential exists for developing a higher rate of officer careerists. An additional finding on the extent of draft-motivation in initial program enrollment confirms this position.

The extent of draft-motivation in enrollment was assessed by asking each respondent this question: "If there had been no draft and you had no military obligation, do you think you would have enrolled in a military officer training program?" Responses were classified into the three categories of (a) "true volunteers," (b) "draft-motivated," and (c) "don't know."

The overall finding was that a very high level of "true-volunteerism" existed among current program enrollees. The majority of men in each program claimed that they would have enrolled, even in the absence of a draft/military obligation. Table IV-3 presents the results, for both ROTC enrollees and men enrolled in the off-campus programs.*

---

*Detailed data on the extent of draft motivation among ROTC enrollees as a function of Basic and Advanced status in Scholarship and Non-scholarship programs appears in Appendix C. For each Service, higher rates of draft-motivation were found for Non-scholarship enrollees than for Scholarship enrollees. Higher rates of draft-motivation were also found among Advanced enrollees than Basic enrollees.

EXTENT OF DRAFT MOTIVATION

Base: Total Current Program Enrollees

Category of Respondent	ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- True Volunteer	60.5	70.1	76.7	87.6	56.1	87.1
- Draft-motivated	36.1	28.2	21.6	11.9	40.0	12.4
- Don't know	3.4	1.8	1.8	0.6	3.9	0.5
	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%

Table IV -3

It is interesting to note that the lowest rates of draft-motivation were reported by enrollees in the USMC PLC program and the Navy AVROC program, while the highest rates of draft-motivation were reported by men in the Navy ROC program and Army ROTC program. Nonetheless, enrollees in each of the programs reported a very high level of true-volunteerism, supporting the contention that increased rates of officer careerist potential could be developed by managers of each program. For convenient reference, Table IV-4 summarizes the overall findings on true-volunteerism, and immediate and long-range career intentions. The data in this table suggest that there is a strong, positive relationship between initial motivation to enroll in the program (true-volunteerism) and avowed intention to remain in the program (immediate goal). Also indicated is a major discrepancy between the intention to remain in the current program, and the extent of announced military careerist potential. However, as noted previously, most enrollees are undecided with regard to making a career of military service, and this indecision could presumably be translated into career intentions by the Services.*

---

*However, the desirability of increasing careerist intentions for these young men must be evaluated by continuing reference to projected manpower requirements for input versus retention, relative to manpower strength authorizations.

SUMMARY DATA ON TRUE-VOLUNTEERISM, INTENTION TO REMAIN IN CURRENT PROGRAM, AND LONG-RANGE MILITARY CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Total Current Program Enrollees

Selected Indices of Motivation & Career Intention	ROTC Programs (Total)			Off-Campus Programs		
	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
- True-Volunteerism (enrollment not predicated on draft-motivation)	60.5	70.1	76.7	87.6	56.1	87.1
- Continued Program Enrollment (willing to stay in current program)	70.2	77.5	81.4	86.5	73.6	93.2
- Military Career Potential						
. Plan a military career	18.0	15.6	22.9	23.6	8.9	19.8
. Plan to stay in for a while	15.8	12.9	14.5	11.6	10.0	11.9
	33.8	28.5	37.4	35.2	18.9	31.7

Table IV -4

Another implication of the data in Table IV-4 is the fact that certain current enrollees do not plan to make a career of the military service, but do plan to remain in their current programs to completion. In the event that requests for enrollments exceed program limitations for enrollees, it may be desirable to "screen" current enrollees to replace them with new applicants possessing avowed intentions to make a career of the military service. Data indicate that many avowed non-careerists among the ROTC enrollee samples intend to stay in the program. Approximately 50% of Army ROTC non-careerists plan to remain in the program, while the rates of remaining in the program are 54% for Navy ROTC non-careerists and 45% for Air Force ROTC non-careerists. Similar findings were noted among off-campus enrollees.*

---

*Data indicate that 39% of non-careerists among PLC enrollees plan to remain in the PLC program. The rate for ROC/AVROC enrollees is 46%.

CAREER INTENTION DETAILS

It is important to distinguish between Scholarship and Non-scholarship status for ROTC enrollees in assessing their potential as career military officers. In Table IV-2, rates of careerist potential were presented by Service, with a higher rate recorded for USAF ROTC enrollees (37.4%) than for ROTC enrollees in the Army (33.8%) or Navy (28.5%).

Further analyses indicated that differences in career intentions occur as a function of Scholarship versus Non-scholarship status, among both Army and Navy program enrollees. For the Army and the Navy, higher rates of careerist potential are noted for Scholarship enrollees. Thus, the career intention rates for Army Scholarship enrollees are 40% or higher, while the rates for Army Non-scholarship enrollees are 32%-33%. Table IV-5 presents the detailed results, with a further control on Basic/Advanced status. Noteworthy is the finding that career intentions are cited by less than 30% of Navy ROTC enrollees, in each status except Basic Scholarship. Also, the lowest rates of career intentions were noted for Navy ROC enrollees (18.9%) and Navy Advanced Non-scholarship (17.4%).

LONG-RANGE CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Detailed Categorization of Current Program Enrollees

Long-Range Career Plans	Army ROTC				Navy ROTC			
	Scholarship		Non-Scholarship		Scholarship		Non-Scholarship	
	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.
	%		%	%	%	%	%	%
Leave upon completion of obligation	13.6	13.2	24.7	31.2	17.6	15.7	30.0	29.9
Undecided	46.4	42.7	42.0	37.2	50.5	57.1	42.3	52.9
Stay in service for a while	17.4	16.0	15.6	15.8	14.2	13.0	12.3	7.0
	} 40.0	} 44.2	} 33.3	} 31.6	} 31.8	} 27.2	} 27.7	} 17.4
Military Career	22.6	28.2	17.7	15.8	17.6	14.2	15.4	10.4
	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.0%	100.2%

Table IV -5

LONG-RANGE CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Detailed Categorization of Current Program Enrollees

Long-Range Career Plans	USAF ROTC				USMC*		NAVY	
	Scholarship		Non-Scholarship		PLC Program		ROC	AVROC
	Basic	Advanced	Basic	Advanced	Basic	Advanced	Total	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Leave upon completion of obligation	6.9	11.7	15.9	14.0	18.9	19.8	26.1	8.4
Undecided	56.2	51.5	45.6	50.0	46.1	45.1	55.0	59.9
Stay in Service for awhile	15.0	13.8	14.3	15.2	16.6	9.9	10.0	11.9
	36.9	36.8	38.5	36.0	35.1	35.2	18.9	31.7
Military career	21.9	23.0	24.2	20.8	18.5	25.3	8.9	19.8
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

---

*The distinction between Advanced and Basic status for PLC is a convention employed in this report to distinguish upper-classmen from lower-classmen. This distinction is not applied in training status.

Table IV-5 (continued)

It is noteworthy that no difference in career intentions was found for Air Force ROTC enrollees, regardless of program status. There was also no difference in career intentions between Basic and Advanced enrollees in the Marine Corps PLC program.*

PROGRAM CONTINUATION DETAILS

Further analyses were also performed to determine if there were differences in program continuation intentions as a function of Scholarship or Non-scholarship status. Earlier in the chapter, Table IV-1 reported immediate career intentions for program continuation, based on responses from all the enrollees in the Army, Navy, and Air Force ROTC programs. It was found that Army enrollees (70.2%) had a lower rate of expectations for program continuation than did enrollees in programs sponsored by the Navy (77.5%) or the Air Force (81.4%). These analyses were performed on both Basic and Advanced enrollees. It was desirable to investigate the program continuation intentions of only Basic enrollees, for whom a substantial period of time remained for committment to the program. In these detailed analyses, the distinction between Scholarship and Non-scholarship was also made.

Detailed analyses indicated that differences in program continuation intentions occur as a function of Scholarship versus Non-scholarship status. Further, the analyses revealed that the enrollees in Scholarship programs reported uniformly higher rates of program continuation intentions for each Service than did Non-scholarship enrollees. Details of the results appear in Table IV-6.

---

*No analysis of career intentions for Basic versus Advanced ROC or AVROC enrollees was made because an insufficient number of cases of Basic enrollees was available.

INTENTION TO CONTINUE INTO ADVANCED ROTC PROGRAMS

Base: Current Enrollees in Basic ROTC Programs

Intend to Continue Into Advanced ROTC	ARMY ROTC		NAVY ROTC		USAF ROTC	
	Scholarship (%)	Non-Scholarship (%)	Scholarship (%)	Non-Scholarship (%)	Scholarship (%)	Non-Scholarship (%)
- Yes	98.6	79.0	87.8	79.1	97.8	80.9
- No	.7	8.4	5.0	12.2	1.1	11.2
- Don't Know/No Answer	.7	12.6	7.2	8.7	1.1	7.9
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table IV - 6

Because of the consistently lower rate of program continuation intentions reported by Basic enrollees in the Non-scholarship programs, it was deemed unnecessary to analyze factors associated with long-range career intentions for men in the Basic Non-scholarship status.* Hence, all results on this topic presented in Chapter V are based on analyses of three subsamples of (1) Basic Scholarship enrollees, (2) Advanced Scholarship enrollees, and (3) Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees.

---

*This decision was further supported by the fact that Army and Navy Basic Non-scholarship enrollees also reported lower rates of long-range career intentions than did their peers in Basic Scholarship status (see Table IV-5).

CHAPTER V

FACTORS RELATED TO CAREER INTENTIONS FOR ROTC ENROLLEES

FACTORS RELATED TO CAREER INTENTIONS FOR ROTC ENROLLEES

Additional analyses were performed for ROTC program enrollees to identify factors related to the avowed intention to either (a) make a career of military service as an officer; or (b) remain in the service beyond completion of the initial term of obligation.* In addition to variations in long-range career intentions by program (see Table IV-2) and by draft-motivation at entry (see Table IV-3), further analyses were performed to determine the extent to which each of the following were related to long-range career intentions:

1) Educational expectations
2) Life goals
3) Reasons for military affiliation
4) Knowledge of total earnings for a beginning officer

In addition, ROTC enrollees (only) were queried to determine the best features of the ROTC program, and the worst features of the ROTC program. These responses were also related to stated career intentions.

Separate analyses were performed for nine (9) subgroups of ROTC program enrollees:

1) Army Basic Scholarship enrollees
2) Army Advanced Scholarship enrollees
3) Army Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees
4) Navy Basic Scholarship enrollees

---

*The precise response options to the question on long-range career intentions were (a) "Yes, I plan to make the Service my career," and (b) "Yes, I plan to stay in for a while." The question read, "Do you plan to stay in the Service at the end of your initial obligated period of service as a commissioned officer?"

5) Navy Advanced Scholarship enrollees

6) Navy Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees

7) Air Force Basic Scholarship enrollees

8) Air Force Advanced Scholarship enrollees

9) Air Force Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees

Because of the *a priori* assumption that many Basic Non-scholarship enrollees were unlikly to complete their ROTC program and enter the Service, the analyses described in this chapter were not made for enrollees in Basic Non-scholarship status.*

EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS

The relationship of educational expectations to long-range career intentions proved complex. For enrollees in Advanced Scholarship status, there was a consistent positive relationship between expectations for post-graduate training and avowed career intentions. This finding held for ROTC enrollees in each Service. However, the reverse held for enrollees in Army and Air Force Advanced Non-scholarship programs, where post-graduate expectations were inversely related to announced career intentions. See Table V-1 for the complete results.

---

*Chapter IV contains data on the program completion intentions of Basic enrollees.

RELATIONSHIP OF EDUCATIONAL EXPECTATIONS TO MILITARY OFFICER CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Selected ROTC Program Enrollees

-Basic Scholarship-

	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
Highest Level of Education Student Expects to Achieve	Plan to Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service
	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)	(%)
College Graduate	38.1	30.5	20.9	25.1	34.9	24.7	46.5	38.1	46.4
Beyond College	61.9	69.5	79.0	75.1	65.1	75.4	54.1	61.9	53.7
	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.2	100.0	100.1	100.6	100.0	100.1

-Advanced Scholarship-

	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
Highest Level of Education Student Expects to Achieve	Plan to Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
College Graduate	28.6	25.3	13.8	45.0	23.8	20.0	34.9	27.7	12.5
Beyond College	71.4	74.7	86.1	55.4	76.2	80.0	65.4	72.3	87.4
	100.0	100.0	99.9	100.4	100.0	100.0	100.3	100.0	99.9

-Advanced Non-Scholarship-

	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
Highest Level of Education Student Expects to Achieve	Plan to Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service	Plan To Leave Service	Undecided	Plan To Remain In Service
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
College Graduate	27.0	22.6	36.6	45.9	15.3	19.6	3.8	19.1	23.4
Beyond College	73.0	77.4	63.3	53.5	84.7	79.4	96.2	80.9	76.6
	100.0	100.0	99.9	99.4	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table V - 1

For the majority of these samples, the relationship of eventual post-graduate training expectations to military officer career intentions was found to be positive.

It is useful to keep this finding in mind, as subsequent data on the types of training/education which are related to career intentions will add substance to these findings. The data appear in this chapter under the heading of Reasons for Military Affiliation.

LIFE GOALS

Each respondent in the survey was presented with a list of ten (10) life and career goals. From this list, each respondent was asked to specify the first most important goal. In this section, an analysis was made to determine which life goals were consistently related to avowed long-range career intentions. Only those goals bearing either a positive or a negative relationship to career intention for these samples of ROTC enrollees will be presented and discussed in this section.* Findings will be discussed separately for each Service, then summarized.

Among Army ROTC enrollees, "doing challenging work" and "adventure/excitement" were important life goals which were related in a positive direction to career intentions. "Doing challenging work" was the more frequently cited of these two goals. Conversely, "being able to do what I want to in a job" was negatively related to announced career intention. See Table V-2 for complete data on Army ROTC enrollees.

---

*Three (3) goals were unrelated to career intention for each sample. These goals were: (1) "Making a lot of money": (2) "Raising my own social level"; and (3) "Recognition/status."

RELATIONSHIP OF LIFE/CAREER GOALS TO MILITARY OFFICER CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Selected Army ROTC Program Enrollees

Selected Life and Career Goals	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
Working for a better society	9.5	8.4	8.0	10.7	9.9	11.7	10.1	11.3	11.1
Doing challenging work	9.5	9.7	29.0	14.3	29.7	27.6	20.2	21.7	23.3
Learning as much as I can	33.2	25.0	17.7	14.3	9.9	6.3	12.4	13.2	13.3
Helping other people	-	13.9	14.5	18.0	13.2	13.8	18.0	14.2	14.5
Having a secure, steady job	18.9	19.4	9.7	10.7	8.8	11.7	12.4	14.2	12.2
Being able to do what I want to in a job. .	18.9	12.5	8.0	25.0	12.1	10.6	18.0	10.4	6.7
Adventure/Excitement	4.9	4.2	9.7	3.6	9.9	14.9	2.2	8.5	13.3

Table V - 2

Among Navy ROTC enrollees, life goals related to career intentions in a positive direction were "doing challenging work" (except for Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees) and "adventure/excitement." "Doing challenging work" was the more frequently cited of these two goals. The goal of "being able to do what I want to in a job" was negatively related to career intentions. These findings were also noted for Army ROTC enrollees.

RELATIONSHIP OF LIFE/CAREER GOALS TO MILITARY OFFICER CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Selected Navy ROTC Program Enrollees

Selected Life and Career Goals	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan to Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
Working for a better society	8.4	18.5	13.9	3.6	13.3	18.1	15.1	11.0	13.1
Doing challenging work	8.4	26.2	30.8	13.7	21.9	31.9	27.0	32.7	6.5
Learning as much as I can	22.2	12.6	9.2	13.7	8.5	12.1	-	17.4	13.1
Helping other people	22.2	17.5	9.3	30.9	15.3	12.1	11.4	15.3	26.2
Having a secure, steady job	8.4	4.9	13.9	3.6	9.5	4.0	11.4	6.4	13.1
Being able to do what I want to in a job	25.1	12.6	10.8	13.7	22.8	7.9	19.5	11.0	6.5
Adventure/Excitement	2.9	3.9	10.8	13.7	6.6	14.0	3.8	2.1	13.1

Table V - 3

The goal of "helping other people" varied in its relationship to career intention among Army and Navy enrollees. Among Army Basic Scholarship enrollees, this goal was related in a somewhat positive direction to career intention; among Navy Basic Scholarship enrollees, the direction of the relationship was decidedly negative. The goal of "learning as much as I can" tended to be related in a negative direction to avowed career intentions, for both Army and Navy ROTC enrollees (except among Navy Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees). This finding is also relevant to the educational expectations topic discussed previously and also treated in the section on Reasons for Military Affiliation.

Among Air Force ROTC enrollees, the following life goals were related to career intentions in a positive direction: (1) "learning as much as I can"; and (2) "working for a better society." "Working for a better society" was the more frequently cited of these two goals. There was negligible evidence that endorsement of these goals was related positively to career intentions in the Army and Navy ROTC samples. However, the goal of "being able to do what I want to in a job" was found to be negatively related to avowed career intentions, and this finding was consistent across each Service sample of ROTC enrollees--Army, Navy and Air Force.

RELATIONSHIP OF LIFE CAREER GOALS TO MILITARY OFFICER CAREER INTENTIONS

Base: Selected USAF ROTC Program Enrollees

Selected Life and Career Goals	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan to Remain In Service (%)
Working for a better society	7.6	11.4	17.5	8.7	7.9	17.7	15.4	12.4	15.6
Doing challenging work	15.3	13.2	24.7	17.3	24.8	15.3	30.8	28.1	29.7
Learning as much as I can.	-	14.3	10.2	4.3	7.9	6.9	7.7	14.6	12.5
Helping other people	15.3	15.3	17.3	21.9	14.9	25.0	15.4	13.5	3.1
Having a secure, steady job	7.6	12.4	10.2	4.3	10.9	12.5	7.7	13.5	18.8
Being able to do what I want to in a job	22.9	20.9	14.6	21.9	18.8	9.7	15.4	11.2	10.9
Adventure/Excitement	22.9	11.4	5.7	13.0	9.9	9.7	3.8	3.4	3.1

Table V - 4

Other findings unique to Air Force ROTC enrollees were the *lack* of any appreciable relationship between career intentions and the goals of "adventure/excitement" and "doing challenging work." The latter, while highly endorsed by Air Force enrollees, was related positively to career intentions among only USAF Basic Scholarship enrollees, while among Army and Navy enrollees it was found to be related to career intentions among several subgroups. The goal of "adventure/excitement" was negatively related to career intentions among USAF Basic Scholarhsip enrollees -- while among the samples of Army and Navy enrollees the relationship was either positive or non-existent.

In summary, compared to non-careerists, potential careerists among Air Force ROTC enrollees cite "bettering society" and to a lesser extent, "learning as much as I can" as life goals, while Army and Navy enrollees tend not to do so. Conversely, comparing potential non-careerists to careerists among the Army and Navy ROTC enrollees, the goal of "adventure/excitement" and particuaarly the goal of "doing challenging work" tend to be related positively to career intentions -- more so than among Air Force enrollees. There appears to be differences in motivation between the Armed Services which may be important in efforts to expand the careerist base among current ROTC enrollees.

REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

In addition to reviewing various general life and career goals, each ROTC enrollee in the survey was presented a list of thirteen (13) possible reasons for applying for military officer training. The list appears below:

POTENTIAL REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

1. Military career opportunities
2. Travel, adventure, and new experiences
3. Serve my country
4. Opportunity for further academic education
5. Qualify for G.I. Bill benefits
6. Pay and allowances
7. Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.
8. Avoid being drafted
9. Become more mature
10. Status and prestige of being an officer
11. Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job
12. Fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice
13. Opportunity for special professional/technical training

The respondent was asked to consider each reason, and to report how strongly it influenced his decision to apply for military officer training -- strong influence, some influence, or no influence at all. In this section, findings are presented on the extent and direction of relationships between announced career intentions and the attribution of strong influence to each of these reasons for military affiliation. Findings are presented in a series of three tables, one for each Armed Service which sponsors an ROTC program.

Among Army ROTC enrollees, the reasons for applying for military officer training consistently related to career intentions in a positive direction were as follows: (1) "military career opportunities"; (2) "serve my country" (patriotism); and to a lesser extent, (3) the status and prestige of being an officer." Also related positively were "travel, adventure, and new experiences" (see previous section on Life Goals) and "benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc." However, "pay and allowances" had a complex relationship to career intentions, with a slight negative relationship noted among Army Basic Scholarship enrollees.

RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER INTENTIONS TO STRONG INFLUENCES IN REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

Base: Selected Army ROTC Enrollees

Reasons for Military Affiliation	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
Military career opportunities	23.8	44.4	72.6	10.7	39.5	74.5	12.4	32.1	75.5
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	14.3	55.6	66.0	42.7	67.0	74.5	38.2	50.0	67.8
Serve my country	23.8	34.7	61.3	14.3	33.0	57.4	23.6	37.7	62.2
Opportunity for further academic education. . .	28.7	52.8	59.7	35.7	37.4	40.5	18.0	22.6	24.4
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits	18.1	11.1	19.3	18.0	15.4	12.7	18.0	26.4	13.3
Pay and allowances	33.2	27.8	25.7	14.3	19.8	23.4	15.7	29.3	28.9
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc.. . .	18.9	29.2	38.7	10.7	22.0	38.4	18.0	28.3	42.2
Avoid being drafted	38.1	8.4	6.4	32.0	16.5	5.3	60.7	31.1	13.3
Become more mature	4.9	18.1	22.5	18.0	14.3	23.4	18.0	21.7	30.0
Status and prestige of being an officer	9.5	25.0	29.1	3.6	15.4	29.8	10.1	18.9	32.2
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job .	9.5	9.7	14.6	7.0	13.2	11.7	4.5	14.2	8.9
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time . . of my choice	28.7	26.4	24.2	39.3	36.2	25.5	42.7	37.7	30.0
Opportunity for special professional/technical. training	23.8	40.2	49.9	7.0	29.7	43.6	15.7	28.3	40.0

Table V - 5

For each Army ROTC subgroup, positive relationships were noted between career intentions and the "opportunity for special professional/technical training," but the relationship to career intentions of "opportunity for further academic education" differed by subgroup.

The reason, "avoid being drafted," was negatively related to career intentions (see Chapter IV). Also negatively related to a lesser extent was the reason, "fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice."

Among Navy ROTC enrollees, many findings analogous to Army findings were noted. For each subgroup of Navy ROTC enrollees, the reasons for applying for military officer training which were related positively to announced career intentions were the following: (1) "serve my country;" (2) "military career opportunities;" (3) the "status and prestige of being an officer;" and (4) the "opportunity for special professional/technical training." The "officer status and prestige" reason was accorded less endorsement than the other three reasons. The "opportunity for further academic education" was related to career intentions in a complex manner -- negatively for Navy Scholarship enrollees, but positively for Navy Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees.

RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER INTENTIONS TO STRONG INFLUENCES IN REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

Base: Selected Navy ROTC Enrollees

Reasons for Military Affiliation	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan to Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan to Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
Military career opportunities.	22.2	40.8	64.7	10.4	30.5	67.9	7.6	6.4	66.4
Travel, adventure, and new experiences	50.0	60.2	66.2	45.0	60.0	68.1	65.4	60.9	59.8
Serve my country	27.8	37.9	66.2	10.4	34.3	60.0	34.6	43.4	66.4
Opportunity for further academic education . . .	61.1	49.5	44.6	38.1	40.1	32.1	11.4	13.1	53.3
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits.	14.0	5.8	4.7	6.8	7.6	7.9	27.0	8.6	-
Pay and allowances	16.7	20.4	17.0	27.7	26.7	10.0	23.2	15.3	13.1
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc. . . .	8.4	17.5	21.5	3.6	23.8	34.0	23.2	15.3	13.1
Avoid being drafted.	22.2	10.7	1.6	45.0	10.5	10.0	57.8	30.3	6.5
Become more mature	16.7	18.5	15.5	6.8	17.2	10.0	11.4	21.7	13.1
Status and prestige of being an officer.	14.0	13.6	30.6	10.4	19.0	20.0	11.4	15.3	19.6
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job. .	8.4	6.8	6.3	6.8	7.6	6.0	7.6	4.3	19.6
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time. . . of my choice	36.2	16.5	15.5	24.1	22.8	22.1	61.6	47.7	32.7
Opportunity for special professional/tehnhical training	22.2	38.8	53.9	20.8	38.1	40.0	19.5	17.4	39.3

Table V - 6

Career intentions were negatively related to attributing a strong influence to "pay and allowances" in the decision to apply for military officer training. However, "benefits" as an influence were positively related to career intentions among Navy Scholarship enrollees.

The reason, "avoid being drafted," and the reason, "fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice," were found to be negatively related to career intentions among Navy ROTC enrollees. These findings are consistent with the results for Army ROTC enrollees.

Among Air Force ROTC enrollees, the following reasons for applying for military officer training attributed strong influence were found to be related positively to career intentions: (1) "military career opportunities;" (2) "serve my country;" (3) the "status and prestige of being an officer;" and (4) the "opportunity for special professional/technical training." The "officer status and prestige" reason was accorded less endorsement than the other three reasons. Also consistently related to career intentions were "benefits" and "travel, adventure and new experiences" (except among Basic Scholarship enrollees).

RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER INTENTIONS TO STRONG INFLUENCES

IN REASONS FOR MILITARY AFFILIATION

Base: Selected USAF ROTC Enrollees

Reasons for Military Affiliation	-Basic Scholarship-			-Advanced Scholarship-			-Advanced Non-Scholarship-		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan to Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
Military career opportunities	30.6	56.2	79.8	13.0	38.6	77.8	30.8	55.1	81.3
Travel, Adventure, and new experiences. . . .	69.4	59.0	68.1	21.9	63.3	65.3	42.3	56.2	62.5
Serve my country	15.3	36.2	62.3	8.7	46.6	58.3	26.9	34.8	43.8
Opportunity for further academic education ..	46.5	36.2	33.3	39.2	28.7	37.5	30.8	33.7	40.6
Qualify for G. I. Bill benefits.	15.3	6.7	7.2	4.3	10.9	9.7	11.5	9.0	9.4
Pay and allowances	46.5	25.7	18.9	17.3	21.8	26.4	11.5	28.1	28.1
Benefits such as medical care, BX/PX, etc. . .	22.9	27.6	33.3	13.0	26.7	43.0	19.2	37.1	50.0
Avoid being drafted	7.6	13.3	7.3	52.2	16.8	2.8	50.0	24.7	9.4
Become more mature	7.6	13.3	13.1	8.7	18.8	20.9	7.7	9.0	9.4
Status and prestige of being an officer . . .	7.6	9.5	17.4	8.7	10.9	16.6	7.7	9.0	21.9
Difficulty in finding a suitable civilian job	7.6	8.6	10.2	21.9	12.9	13.9	11.5	19.1	14.1
Fulfilling my military obligation at a time . of my choice	46.5	21.9	17.5	39.2	34.7	18.1	38.5	37.1	18.6
Opportunity for special professional/technical training	61.8	42.9	63.8	39.2	54.5	55.5	34.6	43.8	50.0

Table V - 7

Inversely related to career intentions among Air Force ROTC enrollees were application for military officer training to "avoid being drafted" and for "fulfilling my military obligation at a time of my choice."

In summary, many common reasons for initially applying for ROTC were found to be related positively to career intentions for all ROTC program enrollees. Included were patriotism, military career opportunities, the status and prestige of being an officer, and military benefits. While "officer status and prestige" was one of the most important reasons for applying, it was not the most important influence in career intentions among enrollees; patriotism and career opportunities were more frequently endorsed.

The relationship of military pay and allowances to careerist intentions was complex -- negative in some instances and positive or unrelated in other cases. Draft motivation (serving to avoid the draft; serving at a time other than one's choice) was negatively related to career intentions.

The opportunity for special professional or technical training was generally related to career intentions in a positive direction, while the opportunity for further academic education was negatively related or unrelated in most cases, and positively related to career intentions only for Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees. In general, this finding taken in conjunction with the earlier finding on post-graduate educational expectations suggests that potential careerists in ROTC may seek specialized training as opposed to advanced education for its own sake.

KNOWLEDGE OF OFFICER EARNINGS

Each ROTC enrollee was asked to estimate about how much money in total a beginning officer would earn in a month. The question was clarified with the stipulation that the amount include basic pay plus allowances for an unmarried commissioned officer. The correct response was coded in a range of between $601 and $800 per month. An underestimate would be less than $600; an overestimate would be more than $800. The following figure presents results for the total ROTC enrollee population.* It is noteworthy that almost half of the current ROTC enrollee population stated an amount in the correct range. However, over 30% estimated that a beginning officer would earn between $401 and $600 a month.

ESTIMATED TOTAL MONTHLY OFFICER EARNINGS**

Base: Total ROTC Enrollees

Amount	Percent
Less than $200 a month	0.6
$201 - $400 a month	3.9
$401 - $600 a month	31.3
$601 - $800 a month	48.9
$801 - $1,000 a month	8.5
$1,001 - $1,250 a month	0.7
Don't know	5.9
	99.8%

**Beginning earnings of basic pay plus allowances for an unmarried commissioned officer.

Almost 90% of the current ROTC enrollees estimated total monthly earnings for a beginning officer at between $401 and $1,000 a month. Further analyses are restricted to persons estimating amounts in this range.

---

*Including Basic Non-scholarship enrollees and men in each of the other categories.

The crucial question to be addressed in this section is simply: Is there a relationship between career intentions and the estimated range of total earnings for a beginning officer? Results are given in Table V-8.

RELATIONSHIP OF CAREER INTENTIONS TO SELECTED ESTIMATES OF TOTAL EARNINGS FOR BEGINNING MILITARY OFFICERS

Base: Selected ROTC Program Enrollees

-Basic Scholarship-

Selected Categories for Estimated Total Earnings of a Beginning Officer	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)	Plan To Leave Service (%)	Undecided (%)	Plan To Remain In Service (%)
$401-$600 a month	47.6	34.7	37.1	44.4	37.9	35.4	7.6	22.8	36.3
$601-$800 a month*	28.7	51.4	53.3	30.6	48.5	50.8	77.1	55.2	40.6
$801-$1000 a month	18.9	9.7	3.0	16.7	8.8	10.8	15.3	15.3	16.0

-Advanced Scholarship-

Selected Categories for Estimated Total Earnings of a Beginning Officer	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %
$401-$600 a month	18.0	22.0	25.5	20.8	24.8	24.1	8.7	20.8	19.5
$600-$800 a month"	57.0	68.1	65.9	62.2	67.7	70.0	87.0	69.3	68.0
$801-$1000 a month	18.0	4.4	5.4	17.3	4.8	4.1	4.3	8.9	11.1

-Advanced Non-Scholarship-

Selected Categories for Estimated Total Earnings of a Beginning Officer	Army ROTC Enrollees			Navy ROTC Enrollees			USAF ROTC Enrollees		
	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %	Plan To Leave Service %	Undecided %	Plan To Remain In Service %
$401-$600 a month	25.9	28.3	23.3	23.2	32.7	39.3	11.5	31.5	25.0
$601-$800 a month*	62.9	59.4	66.7	73.0	60.9	59.8	69.2	61.8	54.7
$801-$1000 a month	3.4	6.6	7.8	3.8	2.1	-	15.4	6.7	14.1

---

* Correct range of estimates.

Table V - 8

Several different relationships are noted. For Army and Navy Basic Scholarship enrollees, potential careerists tend to provide accurate estimates, while non-careerists either underestimate or overestimate earnings. For Army and Navy Advanced Scholarship enrollees, the provision of either correct estimates or underestimates is positively related to career intentions.

In contrast with the other Services, Air Force ROTC enrollees who express career intentions are more likely to underestimate total officer earnings, while non-careerists are more likely to estimate the correct amount of earnings. (This same finding is also noted for Navy Advanced Non-scholarship enrollees.) The fact that accurate knowledge of earnings may be inversely related to career intentions may have some dramatic implications for the use of monetary incentives in increasing retention. At the very least, these data suggest that overestimates of earnings are seldom generated by potential careerists.* Hence, one might conclude that factors other than knowledge of pay serve as "motivators" to enhance retention. The following assessments of the ROTC program by these current enrollees will support and amplify this conclusion.

BEST FEATURES OF ROTC

Each enrollee was asked: "What is the best feature in the ROTC Program?" Responses in the precise wording of the enrollee were content-analyzed and tabulated. Analyses were performed of these responses by content category to determine which comments were positively and negatively related to career intentions.

---

*See the data in Table V-8 on Air Force Advanced Scholarship enrollees for the only major exception.

In the majority of the ROTC samples, the following comments were related to career intentions in a positive manner: (1) "ROTC develops leadership potential;" (2) "ROTC provides an opportunity to become an officer;" and (3) "Knowledge gained of the Military in general." These comments appear to stress leadership and military information acquisition.* Conversely, the following comments were found to be expressed more by non-careerists than by potential careerists: (1) "ROTC provides a Scholarship program/educational opportunity;" and (2) "ROTC provides a subsistence allowance." Hence, it would appear that non-careerists were less able to evaluate ROTC in a positive manner as possessing attributes beyond the essentials of a subsidized college education, whereas potential careerists evaluated the program as management development with an emphasis on military service.

WORST FEATURES OF ROTC

As a method of eliciting comments which might assist in improving ROTC, each ROTC enrollee was asked: "What is the biggest problem with the ROTC Program?" Verbatim responses were content-analyzed by category and tabulated. Analyses were then performed to determine which comments were made more frequently by potential careerists compared to non-careerists.

In the majority of the ROTC samples, non-careerists were more likely than potential careerists to criticize ROTC for the following aspects: (1) "Unnecessary drills or marching;" (2) "Over emphasis on dress or hair length;" and (3) "Strict/rigid policy." Hence, the non-careerist seems most concerned about the military aspects of the program.

---

*Also more frequently stated by potential careerists than non-careerists was the comment that ROTC provided an "Actual application of course work." This finding may be related to the findings in Chapter VI on the quality of ROTC coursework and enrollee suggestions for improvements in course content.

Conversely, potential careerists are more likely to criticize the program for the following reasons than non-careerists: (1) "The hostile attitude toward ROTC by non-members;" and (2) the fact that there are some "poor quality enrollees."

SUMMARY

At the risk of premature generalization, a narrative profile of the potential careerist in ROTC suggests that his motivations extend beyond the college subsidy he receives. His career expectations are military in orientation, and his educational objectives call for post-graduate work, with the emphasis on technology/specialization. He is desirous of challenging work and adventure/excitement as life goals, and seeks the profession of a military officer as offering status and prestige. While military benefits are an incentive to retention, the potential careerist is less concerned with pay and allowances than the non-careerist -- and may actually underestimate his earning power as a military officer.

CHAPTER VI

QUALITY OF ROTC INSTRUCTION AND COURSEWORK

QUALITY OF ROTC INSTRUCTION AND COURSEWORK

COMPARISON OF GRADES ACHIEVED IN ROTC WITH COLLEGE GRADES IN GENERAL

One approximate method for assessing the academic quality of the ROTC programs involves a comparison of grades achieved in ROTC courses with overall college GPA. The assumption is made that if students earn higher grades in ROTC coursework than they attain in their composite college curriculum, then the ROTC courses are "easier" and may well possess less academic quality than do college courses in general. This survey was designed to evaluate the quality of ROTC coursework by a comparison of reported grades in ROTC subjects and in college courses in general.

Respondents in ROTC programs were asked to indicate what grades they usually received in ROTC courses. This information was then analyzed against data on the typical grades which they reportedly earned in college.* The following table suggests that students tended to earn higher grades in ROTC courses than they earned in college in general. This finding supports the contention that ROTC courses may be graded on a more lenient basis, and/or that the subject matter is less difficult than college coursework in general.

---

*For practical reasons, this approach was employed in lieu of an evaluation of actual transcripts of grades earned. However, this more precise approach would appear eminently feasible, and might merit consideration.

RELATIONSHIP OF COLLEGE GRADES TO GRADES IN ROTC COURSEWORK

Base: ROTC Program Enrollees

Reported Achieved:	Army ROTC (%)	Navy ROTC (%)	Air Force ROTC (%)
Higher grades in college than in ROTC	5.8	6.0	2.6
Higher Grades in ROTC than in college	59.7	44.5	65.4
The same grades in both ROTC & college	34.5	49.5	32.0
	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table VI - 1

Compared to Navy ROTC enrollees, men in Army ROTC programs and Air Force ROTC programs were more likely to report higher grades in ROTC coursework than in college courses in general.

ATTITUDES TOWARD ROTC COURSEWORK AND INSTRUCTION

Another approach to assessing the academic quality of ROTC programs was to query representatives of the various college student samples regarding their attitudes toward ROTC courses and ROTC instructors. Questions were framed which required the respondents to evaluate both ROTC coursework and instructors vis-a-vis other college courses and faculty members.

The assessment of the quality of ROTC instruction was found to vary by student status. College students who were not enrolled in ROTC tended to report no opinion about the quality of ROTC instruction. Both non-ROTC college freshmen and off-campus program enrollees responded in this manner. However, the majority of current ROTC enrollees tended to view ROTC instructors as "about as good" as the other faculty members at their colleges. Further, a sizeable percentage stated that ROTC instructors were better than the other faculty members at their schools.

APPRAISAL OF THE QUALITY OF ROTC INSTRUCTION

Base: College Student Samples

Quality of ROTC Instructors (vs. Other Faculty)	Non-ROTC College Freshman In ROTC Schools		ROTC Enrollees (Total)			Off-Campus Program Enrollees		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
-ROTC is Better	2.4	3.6	39.8	27.4	31.6	8.3	5.5	4.0
-ROTC is Worse	8.7	3.1	6.1	9.2	7.5	3.4	13.9	3.4
-About as good	23.7	22.1	51.5	61.7	59.0	27.9	18.6	36.2
-No opinion/DK	65.2	71.2	2.6	1.7	1.8	60.4	62.1	56.5
	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	99.9%	100.0%	100.1%	100.1%

Table VI - 2

Further analyses were performed to determine if the appraisal of quality of ROTC instruction varied by enrollee status as Basic/Advanced, or as Scholarship/Non-scholarship. The results of these analyses suggested that there were minor variations in assessment of the quality of ROTC instructors on these dimensions. For example, 4-7% more of the men in Non-scholarship programs claimed that ROTC instructors were superior to other faculty members, than did men in Scholarship programs. Further, 10-12% more of the men in Basic ROTC rated ROTC instruction as superior, compared to the rating provided by men enrolled in Advanced ROTC.

The various college student samples were also asked to appraise the quality of ROTC coursework. The majority of ROTC enrollees stated that the content of ROTC courses was "about as good" as the content of the other courses in their schools. Non-ROTC college freshmen were more likely to state that the comparison of course quality would depend on the course, while enrollees in off-campus programs simply responded that they were not in the (ROTC) program or did not know the quality of the courses.

APPRAISAL OF THE QUALITY OF ROTC COURSE WORK

Base: College Student Samples

Quality of ROTC Courses (vs. other courses)	Non-ROTC College Freshmen In ROTC Schools		ROTC Enrollees (Total)			Off-Campus Program Enrollees		
	Male (%)	Female (%)	Army (%)	Navy (%)	USAF (%)	PLC (%)	ROC (%)	AVROC (%)
-ROTC is Better	2.7	2.2	19.9	13.5	14.0	5.8	3.9	4.0
-ROTC is Worse	15.4	5.6	15.2	12.5	16.4	7.5	13.0	9.9
-About as Good	27.1	27.4	48.7	58.1	58.0	27.2	20.0	30.2
-Depends on the course	36.4	39.7	16.0	15.3	11.2	11.8	16.4	11.4
-Not in Program/DK	18.5	25.1	.2	0.7	0.4	47.6	46.4	44.6
	100.1%	100.0%	100.0%	100.1%	100.0%	99.9%	99.9%	100.1%

Table VI - 3

Further analyses of ROTC enrollee opinions were made by enrollee status. The results of these analyses suggested that there were minor differences in the assessment of the quality of ROTC coursework, depending on the status of the enrollee. Basic ROTC enrollees in Army and Navy programs were more likely to report ROTC coursework as superior to other college coursework than were Advanced enrollees in these programs. For each Service, Advanced enrollees were more critical of ROTC course content than were Basic enrollees. Non-scholarship enrollees were more favorable in their appraisal of ROTC course content than were enrollees in Scholarship programs.

It is interesting to note that fewer ROTC enrollees claimed that ROTC course content compared favorably with the content of other college courses, than defended ROTC instruction as superior to other instruction received from other faculty members (compare Table VI-2 and Table VI-3). This finding, taken in conjunction with the earlier findings indicating higher grades were earned in ROTC compared to college grades in general, suggest that the ROTC curriculum may be less challenging than the regular college curriculum and perhaps more variable than in the quality of the instructors who teach ROTC. Cognizant of this possibility, it is instructive to review the suggestions of ROTC enrollees for improvements in the content of ROTC coursework.

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN ROTC COURSEWORK

The major suggestions for coursework improvement presented by current ROTC enrollees were designated as the need for:

- More practical applications (of course content);

- Course orientation more related to actual military life (as opposed to theory); and
- More challenging textbooks ("higher level" texts).

Although the objectives of increased challenge and increased relevance/practicality may appear ambiguous these and other suggested improvements merit serious consideration in the evaluation of curricula for ROTC programs for the future.* The following table presents the most frequently suggested improvements, by service, for ROTC enrollees.

---

*Among suggestions for improving the quality of ROTC instruction, the most frequently cited suggestions included the need for "more interesting material", and for "more practical application of knowledge learned"---comments reiterated in the context of changes suggested for course content as noted above. Also cited was the need for "more professional" teachers. This comment was more frequently made by Army and Navy ROTC enrollees (19% and 15%, respectively) than by Air Force ROTC enrollees (9%).

MAJOR SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN ROTC COURSE CONTENT

Base: Current ROTC Enrollees

Suggested Improvements in ROTC Course work*	Current ROTC Enrollees		
	Army ROTC	Navy ROTC	USAF ROTC
Less theory/More practical application	15.4	14.3	14.3
Material should be updated	5.4	6.1	6.4
Broaden Curriculum	6.1	8.3	6.7
Have courses that relate to actual military life	9.0	11.5	9.6
Texts of higher level/ More challenging	8.7	7.4	11.0
No improvement necessary	14.9	15.6	13.8
Don't Know	9.9	9.8	6.9
No answer	18.7	20.1	16.2

* Only suggestions provided by 5% or more of the respondents are tabled.

Table VI -4

In addition to the suggestions noted above, the only other suggestions for change which were endorsed by more than 5% of the samples of ROTC enrollees were the need to "broaden the curriculum" and to "update the material."

Approximately 14%-16% of the respondents felt that no change to the ROTC curriculum was required.

DISCUSSION

Overview

Prior to the performance of this survey, there was a dearth of empirical research concerning the attitudes of American youth toward affiliation with the various college-related military officer training programs. Two of the most recent federally sponsored surveys (Guinn et al., 1971; Griffith, 1972) focused on: (1) the importance of draft-motivation among enrollees in Air Force ROTC programs, and (2) a comparison of the attitudes of Negro and Caucasian cadets toward Air Force ROTC. However, no studies have been conducted which attempted to relate attitudinal and demographic correlates to potential enrollment in precommissioning programs. Although the attitudes of civilian high school seniors and college freshmen toward ROTC programs have been investigated (Ayer, 1972), no distinction has been made in these studies between attitudes and program affiliation among potential male and female enrollees.

One major goal of this present study was to provide information on the extent of interest in applying for various military officer training programs sponsored by the Army, Navy, and Air Force among target samples of male and female high school seniors and college freshmen. A second goal of the study was to estimate the extent of military career potential among current program enrollees in the ROTC and enrollees in off-campus military officer training programs. This survey was unique in that samples of cadets were interviewed from three ROTC programs and three off-campus programs. Enrollees from the three ROTC programs were classified according to both Basic/Advanced status and Scholarship/Non-scholarship status. The study was designed to provide profiles of career-oriented enrollees which included (1) demographic information, (2) attitudes toward ROTC, (3) general knowledge of military officer training programs, and (4) sources of knowledge about the military officer training programs. Similar profiles were constructed for potential male and female enrollees from target populations of high school and college civilian youth.

Applicant Potential

Results of this survey indicate that high school seniors represent the most fertile population for recruiting potential enrollees in military officer training programs.* Between 9-18% of the high school seniors expressed interest in applying for one (or more) of these programs, as compared to 1-3% of college freshmen interviewed. Ayer (1972) reported similar results from personal interviews conducted among a nationwide sample of 500 high school seniors. Twelve percent (12%) of the respondents in the Ayer survey indicated that they would probably enroll in an ROTC program.

Although college freshmen in the present survey represented only a small potential applicant population, other researchers have identified special instances in which higher percentages of college freshmen and sophomores indicated an interest in applying for the ROTC programs. In interviews with approximately 100 non-ROTC college sophomores, Ayer found that between 12-21% would consider enrolling in the ROTC programs with modifications (e.g., suspension of the active duty requirements, increments in the monthly allowance). In another study, Johnston and Bachman (1972) reported that 9% of interviewed college freshmen attending institutions with no ROTC programs claimed they would have enrolled in ROTC if these programs had been offered.

---

*In total, applicant potential for twelve separate programs was evaluated. These programs included Army Scholarship/Non-scholarship, Navy Scholarship/Non-scholarship, USAF Scholarship/Non-scholarship, PLC Ground, PLC Pilot, PLC Flight Officer, ROC, AVROC Pilot, and AVROC Navigator.

Demographic Profile of Potential Applicant.

Among high school seniors non-whites tended to be more favorable toward affiliation with ROTC programs than whites. Potential applicants also tended to have a lower socio-economic background than non-applicants. Many of the potential applicants also held part time jobs. A majority of these individuals were residents of small or rural communities. Most high school applicants were residents of the South and North Central regions. Non-whites among the college freshmen potential enrollee population also reported a higher rate of affiliation than did whites. Further, their profile was: not employed or working full time; from low socio-economic backgrounds; and from the South. There were no sex differences in expressed interest in enrolling in the ROTC programs.

These profiles are similar to those reported by Johnston and Bachman for potential applicants to the ROTC programs from college freshmen in non-ROTC schools. Such individuals also came from rural areas in the South and were of lower socio-economic status than were non-applicants attending the same schools. In addition, Ayer found that over 50% of the high school senior subsample most likely to enroll in the ROTC programs as college students (the "patriots") were from blue-collar backgrounds.

These results suggest that the Armed Services should examine the possibility of expanding recruitment efforts for the present ROTC programs to include female as well as male high school seniors. Individuals who must rely on their own initiative to finance a college education (e.g., those from lower status backgrounds and those students who presently work) appear more receptive toward the possibility of affiliation with these programs. Minorities also are a potentially important target population. Students entering (or attending) vocational schools, technical schools, community colleges, and junior colleges may also represent a considerable pool of potential program enrollees. Recruiting efforts might also be intensified for residents of non-industrialized areas and communities where the military ethic is traditionally strong, e.g., small communities in the South and Midwest. However, prior to modifying recruitment strategy, information is needed on each of these subsamples of potential applicants to determine if they are qualified to be considered as future military officers.

Program Preference

Both the high school and the college segments of the potential applicant population preferred the Air Force 4-year ROTC Scholarship program over the other ROTC and off-campus programs. Ayer found a similar preference for Air Force ROTC among civilian high school seniors and college sophomores. (However, no distinction was made between Scholarship and Subsistence programs in the Ayer survey.) Second preference in the current survey was for the Army Subsistence program (2 year obligation) and the Navy 4-year Scholarship program. Least preferred were four variations of the off-campus programs. However, potential enrollment rates for one (or more) of the off-campus programs were similar to rates reported for the ROTC programs (5-19% of high school seniors and 1-4% of college freshmen expressed interest in applying for one or more of these off-campus programs).

These results indicate that many potential enrollees are attracted to: (1) programs which provide limited assistance in obtaining a college degree, and (2) programs with shorter periods of military obligation, or (3) the traditional "glamour" military Services, especially those synonymous with aviation. The least preferred programs provide only a subsistence allowance as opposed to full scholarship and require substantially longer terms of military obligation (from 4½ to 6 years for ROC, AVROC, and PLC as compared to 2 years for Army Subsistence).

Perspective on ROTC Applicant Potential

Although expressed interest in the programs among high school seniors was around 11%, the actual rate of application for ROTC was considerably lower (5% for males and 2% for females). However, respondents were asked to indicate their potential for enrollment after they had read a detailed description for the program. Their lack of previous knowledge about the various programs may have contributed to the low actual application rate. Exposure to the program via the written descriptions may have then provided the higher potential application rates. If this is true, then increased advertising and recruitment efforts would seem justified.

The results of this survey are consistent with those reported by Johnston and Bachman. In their research, some 9% of the high school students and college freshmen interviewed expressed an interest in applying for the ROTC programs, but only 4% actually enrolled voluntarily (an additional 2% were enrolled in compulsory ROTC programs).

Career Potential

A majority of current program enrollees were interested in continuing their enrollment in their ROTC program or the off-campus program. For ROTC, seventy-three percent (73%) of enrollees expressed a willingness to remain in their current programs. Equivalent (or higher) rates were found for off-campus program enrollees.

Similarly, 80% or more of the Basic ROTC students in each program indicated that they would continue into the Advanced ROTC program. Ayer found that 67% of Basic ROTC program enrollees intended to continue into the Advanced program.

However, it should be noted that 40-60% of current program enrollees have made no decision about their long-range, future military career intentions. Less than 37% planned to remain in the Service beyond their initial obligation and only approximately 16-23% indicated a definite career intention. Griffith (1972) also reported low levels of expressed career intentions. Fifteen percent (15%) of Black Air Force ROTC cadets and 10% of White cadets intended to make a career of the Air Force. Furthermore, 13% of these cadets claimed they would still select the military as a career even if given a chance to enter civilian life at graduation. A substantial percentage (34-43%) of these USAF cadets were uncertain as to their career potential. This finding is also consistent with the high level of uncertainty evident in the present survey.

Demographic Profile of Current Program Enrollees

Based on data reported by other researchers (Guinn et al, 1971; Ayer, 1972; Griffith, 1972; Johnston and Bachman, 1972) the demographic profile of the current ROTC program enrollee depicts a homogeneous population of predominantly white individuals from middle class backgrounds. A majority of these individuals were residents of small communities in the South and Midwest.

Although racial differences and socio-economic differences existed between potential program applicants and potential military careerists, a majority of individuals from both populations were raised in regions where the military ethic is traditionally strong. This factor, along with several other factors to be discussed, may have been responsible for the high rate of self-motivated enrollment (true volunteers). Approximately 60-77% of the ROTC program enrollees in the current survey reported that they enrolled voluntarily and not as a result of draft motivation. In comparison, 50-60% of Air Force ROTC cadets interviewed by Griffith could be classified as true volunteers. The Ayer survey found that 68% of Army ROTC enrollees claimed that they would have enrolled in a no-draft condition.

Factors Associated with Applicant Potential and Career Potential

Educational Expectations. A higher percentage of high school seniors with ultimate post-graduate expectations were interested in applying to the ROTC program than were peers with more limited educational expectations. Among current program enrollees, a majority of those individuals who planned to remain in the Service expected to continue their studies beyond the initial college degree.

These results suggest that both high school seniors with applicant potential and current program enrollees with careerist potential view the undergraduate military officer training programs as an initial step in achievement of advanced education and/or technical training. Bushnell (1972) found that a higher proportion of racial/ethnic minorities aspired to an advanced degree than did whites. Demographic profiles for respondents in the present survey also showed that a higher percentage of non-whites than whites expressed an interest in applying for these programs, indicating that potential non-white applicants may view these programs as a step toward continuing post-graduate study or training. In addition, demographic variables indicated that a considerable percentage of the potential college freshmen applicants were already employed full time. These individuals could regard military officer training programs as a means of pursuing a career rather than a means of obtaining an education.

Life Goals. Potential applicants in both high school and college tended to select economic and self-motivated choices from a list of future life goals ("making a lot of money," "secure, steady job," "raising my social level"). In a survey of youth's attitudes toward military service, Fisher (1972B) found that a sample of high school students also endorsed having a secure, steady job as their most important life goal. Furthermore, they believed that this goal could be achieved in the military. However, potential careerists among the current program enrollee sample selected adventure/excitement (Army ROTC and Navy ROTC) and working for a better society (Air Force ROTC) more often than non-careerists. Fisher reported that American youth believe that adventure/excitement was also an achievable life goal in the military service.

These results indicate that potential applicants consider the military officer training programs as a means of raising their own social status and later providing a stable employment opportunity. Griffith (1972) reported that most Air Force ROTC cadets enrolled in the program because of (1) the opportunity it provided for a better standard of living in the future, (2) the monthly pay, and (3) the prestige of being an officer.

Differences in selection of life goals between potential enrollees and careerists may be due to demographic differences (especially between race and social level) already reported.

Reasons for Military Affiliation

In general, a majority of the high school seniors who had expressed interest in the Scholarship or Subsistence programs cited "status and prestige of being an officer" or "military career opportunities" as strongly influencing their decision to apply for the ROTC programs. The majority of potential college freshmen applicants indicated the importance of "becoming more mature" as well as "status and prestige of being an officer."

Black and White Air Force cadets surveyed by Griffith (1972) were asked a similar question. The majority of both races indicated that being an officer in the Air Force rather than an enlisted man was their major reason for enrolling in the program. Griffith's (1972) survey data also suggested that status and prestige and opportunity for a better standard of living influenced Air Force cadet decision to apply for ROTC programs.

Johnston and Bachman also found a substantial percentage (50%) of individuals who indicated that the opportunity to become an officer was the most important reason for ROTC enrollment. Almost 50% of the ROTC aspirant population (individuals interested in ROTC who attend non-ROTC affiliated schools) replied in a similar manner.

In the present survey, potential program applicants also were asked to indicate which specific reason strongly influenced their decision to apply for military officer training programs. A majority of high school seniors and male college freshmen were strongly influenced in their decision to apply for one of these programs by such considerations as Branch of Service and the opportunity for ground/air duty. Female college freshmen tended to attribute strong influence in their decision to apply to a variety of reasons including amount of subsistence allowance and summer camp obligation.

Potential Careerists

When asked to indicate which of several general reasons had strongly influenced the decision to continue in the military, potential careerists for all three ROTC programs selected (1) military career opportunities, (2) patriotism, (3) opportunity for special professional/technical training, and (4) status and prestige associated with being an officer.

Relevance of Pay

Potential applicants and potential careerists do not appear to be motivated by anticipated financial remuneration. Less than 10% of ROTC cadets cited payment and allowances as a reason for applying for the ROTC programs (Johnston and Bachman, 1972). Pay and allowances were not selected as a general reason for enrollment in ROTC by any of the target population groups in the present study. In addition, pay and allowances were negatively related to expressed career intentions among the current program enrollees.

Furthermore, approximately half of all potential applicants to the military officer training programs underestimated the total earnings of a beginning military officer. Less than half of these individuals were aware that military officers had received a recent pay increase, and fewer of these individuals could identify the date this increase had taken place. Fifty percent (50%) of current program enrollees knew the correct salary for a beginning officer; with most (35%) of the incorrect responses underestimating the pay range. Although 80% of current program enrollees claimed awareness of the current pay increase, less than half could identify the correct date of the increase. Air Force ROTC cadets in Griffith's study also underestimated starting officer salary.

In summary, most potential program enrollees and potential careerists consider the ROTC program as a means of initiating their education and technical training. Most potential applicants also regard the ROTC programs as providing a means of achieving their major life goals: raising social level, becoming an officer, and providing a secure, steady job. However, neither ROTC potential applicants nor potential military careerists are primarily motivated by anticipation of possible economic advantages accruing from either program enrollment or from a career of service in the military.

Awareness of Military Officer Training Programs

Most high school seniors and college freshmen (95%) had heard of the ROTC programs. The majority knew that the Army sponsored ROTC. However, less than 50% of the college freshmen and only 25% of the high school seniors knew that the Navy and Air Force also sponsored these programs. Ayer's survey found that 70% of high school seniors designated as "patriots" (and therefore assumed to be more likely to join ROTC programs) indicated that all three of the Armed Services had Reserve Officer Training programs.

In the present study, awareness of off-campus programs was found to be very low. Only 20% or less of the target populations had heard of the various off-campus programs (ROC, AVROC, PLC). The inability of youth to relate the programs to the sponsoring Services was particularly noteworthy, i.e., AVROC was cited as an Air Force program when in fact it is sponsored by the Navy.

In general, current program enrollees were better informed than were civilian youth. However, the level of awareness of Subsistence programs among ROTC enrollees was still less than 50%. The level of awareness of ROTC among off-campus program enrollees was also high (97%); but a low level of awareness was found among these enrollees for the off-campus programs other than their respective programs (approximately 45%).

Reported exposure to ROTC advertising was low. Approximately 30% of the high school seniors and college freshmen reported exposure to all three ROTC programs. Approximately 20% of these populations had neither seen nor heard any advertising for ROTC.

No particular group of individuals was specified as a source of information about ROTC by the majority of high school seniors or college freshmen. Thus, the major personal source of information about ROTC cited by high school seniors were friends and school acquaintances. School counselors and teachers were another major informational source. However, fewer than 15% of these groups listed these individuals as their major sources of ROTC information. Among the sample of high school seniors, less than 10% cited any single aspect of the recruiting process, e.g., recruiting brochures, ads, the military recruiter *per se*, etc. The Ayer survey found that 40% of high school seniors labeled "patriots" reported an exposure to pamphlets, flyers, and bulletins advertising ROTC programs. Some 15% had been exposed to TV and radio commercials for ROTC. In the Ayer survey, personal sources of information about ROTC which were cited included guidance personnel, ROTC personnel, and parents.

Academic Quality of ROTC Instruction and Coursework

Most ROTC enrollees (45-65%) reported higher grades earned in ROTC courses than in their general college courses. These results may indicate that the ROTC coursework may be less difficult or graded more leniently than other college coursework in general.

For the current survey, ROTC enrollees tended to rate their instructors as comparable to other faculty (51-62%). However, a substantial percentage (27-40%) felt that the ROTC instructor was better than most other faculty members. In addition, Griffith reported that 70-75% of Air Force ROTC enrollees believed that their instructors were above average or superior when compared to the faculty in general. ROTC enrollees for the current survey also felt that the quality of coursework was comparable to their other courses. However, the reaction to the ROTC instructor was more favorable than to the coursework, perhaps indicating that ROTC coursework is less challenging and of more variable quality than ROTC instructor quality. Griffith, however, reported that a majority of Air Force ROTC cadets felt that the ROTC courses were of some value, but no more or less important than their other college work.

When respondents were asked to provide suggestions for improvement of the ROTC coursework, 15% felt that ROTC coursework needed no improvement. However, approximately 10-15% of the students surveyed felt that ROTC courses should be geared to more practical application of information, or related to military life and that more challenging texts were needed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ayer, N.W. and Yankelovich, D. An Investigation of ROTC Among College and High School Students. Washington, D.C.: N.W. Ayer & Son, Inc., 1972.

Bushnell, D.S. and Zagaris, I. Report from Project FOCUS: Strategies for Change. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1972.

Cochran, C.L. Midshipmen and cadet profiles and national norms: A comparison. Naval War College Review, May 1972, p. 37-47.

Fisher, A.J., Jr. Motivations and Attitudes of Officer Candidates: An Initial Report of Findings from the Officer Pre-Comm Survey. HumRRO CR-D7-72-7, March 1972 (A).

Fisher, A.H., Jr. Attitudes of Youth Toward Military Service: Results of National Surveys Conducted in May 1971, November 1971, and June 1972. HumRRO CR-D7-72-30, October 1972 (B).

Griffin, G.R. A Comparison of Attitudes of Black and White Cadets in AFROTC. AF/DPXY-MR-71-011. Personnel Research and Analysis Division, U.S. Air Force, 1972.

Guinn, N., Alley, W.E., and Farmer, C.B. Impact of an All-Volunteer Force on AFROTC Officer Procurement. Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, AFHRL-TR-71-46, December 1971.

Johnston, J. and Bachman, J. Youth in Transition. Volume V: Young Men and Military Service. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, 1972.

APPENDIX A

DETAILED SAMPLE SIZE INFORMATION FOR PROGRAM ENROLLEES

DETAILED SAMPLE SIZE
INFORMATION FOR
PROGRAM ENROLLEES

Branch of Service	Program Status				
	Scholarship		Non-Scholarship		
	Basic	Advanced	Basic	Advanced	Total
Army ROTC	155	213	243	285	896
Navy ROTC	204	184	132	87	607
USAF ROTC	190	197	198	181	766

	Basic*	Advanced	Total
USMC PLC Program	313	91	404
Navy ROC Program	1	199	200
Navy AVROC Program	1	201	202

---

* No attempt was made to obtain equivalent samples of basic and advanced enrollees in these programs

APPENDIX B

APPLICANT POTENTIAL ITEMS FROM THE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

INTERVIEWER: Q'S. 10A THRU 10D MUST BE ASKED OF ALL RESPONDENTS. HOWEVER, SINCE WE DO NOT WANT TO HAVE ALL RESPONDENTS ASKED THE QUESTIONS IN THE SAME ORDER, PLEASE START WITH THE QUESTION "X'ED" IN RED. CONTINUE SEQUENTIALLY THROUGH Q. 10D THEN GO BACK AND ASK THOSE QUESTIONS WHICH PRECEDED THE QUESTION YOU STARTED WITH.

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT GREEN CARD "A") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10a.

GREEN CARD "A"

The Army, Navy, and Air Force each have College military officer training programs called ROTC* scholarship programs. The Services pay up to 4 years of tuition, fees and provide money for expenses toward a college education. These programs have military courses on campus, and require military training. They also require you to attend summer camps for which you are paid. The choice of schools is restricted to about 375 colleges with ROTC programs. You serve for 4 years as an officer in the Service for which you were trained and an additional period if you become a pilot or navigator.

* ROTC stands for Reserve Officer Training Corps

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the program offered by the Army? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY) (RECORD BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the Navy, which includes the U. S. Marine Corps as an option? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY)

And how about the program offered by the Air Force? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY)

	SERVICE:		
	Army	Navy	Air Force
a. I would apply for this program	30-1	31-1	32-1
b. I would not apply for this program	2	2	2
c. Don't know if I would apply for this program . .	3	3	3

(IF "WOULD APPLY" FOR NAVY PROGRAM. ASK:) Would you prefer to enter the MARINE CORPS or the NAVY after graduation?

Marine Corps 33-1 Navy 2

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT BLUE CARD "B") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10b.

BLUE CARD "B"

The Army, Navy, and Air Force each have a College military officer training program called ROTC Subsistence Allowance Program. The Services provide a monthly allowance for the Junior and Senior years. Usually, men enter these programs after completing 2 years of "Basic ROTC" in their Freshmen and Sophomore years. These programs have military courses on campus, and require military training. They also require you to attend summer camps for which you are paid. The programs are only offered at 375 schools with ROTC programs. You serve 2 years as an officer in the Army after graduating. You serve 3 years as a Navy officer. You serve 4 years as an Air Force officer. You serve an additional period if you should become a pilot or navigator.

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regard the program offered by the Army? (CHECK ONE ANSWER ONLY) (RECORD BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the Navy, which includes the U. S. Marine Corps as an option? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

And how about the program offered by the Air Force? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	SERVICE:		
	Army (2 Years)	Navy (3 Years)	Air Force (4 Years)
a. I would apply for this program	34-1	35-1	36-1
b. I would not apply for this program . .	2	2	2
c. Don't know if I would apply for this program	3	3	3

(IF "WOULD APPLY" FOR NAVY PROGRAM, ASK:) Would you prefer to enter the MARINE CORPS or the NAVY after graduation?

Marine Corps 37-1 Navy 2

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT YELLOW CARD "C") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10c.

YELLOW CARD "C"

The Marine Corps has a College military officer training program called PLC (Platoon Leaders Class). For their last three years in college, a student may choose to receive a monthly subsistence allowance. Students are also paid to attend two 6-week summer camps, usually between the Freshmen-Sophomore years and the Junior-Senior years. There is no military course work on campus and no military training on campus. You attend any accredited college of your choice. You serve 2 1/2 to 4 years as an officer after graduating from college, depending on how many school years you received subsistence allowance. (Pilots and flight officers serve for longer periods.)

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the PLC Program, requiring 2 1/2 to 4 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the PLC Pilot Program, requiring 5 to 6 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

And how about the PLC Flight Officer Program, requiring 5 to 6 years of service as an officer after graduating? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	PLC 2½-4 Years	PLC (PILOT) 5-6 Years	PLC (FLIGHT OFFICER) 5-6 Years
a. I would apply for this program . . .	38-1	39-1	40-1
b. I would not apply for this program .	2	2	2
c. Don't Know if I would apply for this Program	3	3	3

SAY TO ALL RESPONDENTS . . . . Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT PINK CARD "D") which describes a certain type of military officer training program. Please read the card carefully to familiarize yourself with the program and then I would like to get your reaction.

10d.

PINK CARD "D"

The Navy has two "off-campus" College military officer training programs. They are called ROC (Reserve Officer Corps) and AVROC (Aviation Reserve Officer Corps). In both programs, the Navy pays college men to attend two summer camps, one between the Junior-Senior years and the other upon completion of college. There is no military course work on campus and no military training on campus. You attend any school of your choice. In ROC, you serve 3 years as a Navy non-flight officer after graduating from college. In AVROC, you serve as a Navy pilot for 4 1/2 years, or as a Navy navigator for 3 1/2 years -- after you finish flight training.

(AFTER RESPONDENT HAS READ THE CARD, HAND RESPONDENT CARD #10 AND ASK:) Which of these statements would apply to you as regards the ROC Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

Which statement would apply to you as regards the AVROC (Pilot) Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

And how about the AVROC (Navigator) Program? (CHECK ONE ANSWER BELOW)

	ROC	AVROC	
	(3 Years)	(Pilot) (4½ Years)	(Navigator) (3½ Years)
a. I would apply for this program	41-1	42-1	43-1
b. I would not apply for this program	2	2	2
c. Don't Know if I would apply for this program	3	3	3

APPENDIX C

THE EXTENT OF DRAFT MOTIVATION BY PROGRAM PREFERENCE

THE EXTENT OF DRAFT MOTIVATION BY PROGRAM PREFERENCE

Base: Current Program Enrollees

Category of Respondent	Army ROTC				Navy ROTC				USAF ROTC			
	Scholarship		Non-Scholarship		Scholarship		Non-Scholarship		Scholarship		Non-Scholarship	
	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.	Basic	Adv.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
True Volunteer	83.8	77.0	60.1	54.4	83.8	64.7	56.9	52.9	85.1	78.1	80.3	63.5
Draft-Motivated	14.2	21.6	35.4	43.8	15.2	33.7	40.0	43.7	14.4	20.9	18.1	33.2
Don't Know	1.9	1.4	4.5	1.8	1.0	1.6	3.1	3.4	.5	1.0	1.7	3.4
	99.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.1

C-2